

A  
LETTER  
TO HIS GRACE  
EDWARD  
Lord Arch-bishop  
OF  
TUAM.

In Answer to his Charitable ADDRESS.  
To all who are of the Communion of the  
Church of ROME.

By G. NART.

Catholic Priest of St. Michael's, Dublin.

*Parati semper ad Satisfactionem omni  
Poscenti Vos Rationem de ea, quæ in vobis  
est spe. 1 Pet. 3. 15.*

DUBLIN: Printed in the YEAR,  
1728.

LETTER  
 TO HIS GRACE  
 EDWARD  
 Lord Ashburton  
 OF  
 TUNM.

In Answer to his Grace's Letter of the 10th of June 1798.  
 By G. C. C.



Printed by G. C. C. at the British Museum.  
 Printed by G. C. C. at the British Museum.  
 Printed by G. C. C. at the British Museum.

D. D. V. Printed at the British Museum.  
 1798.



A

LETTER

TO HIS GRACE

EDWARD

Lord Arch-bishop

OF

TUTAM.

INTRODUCTION.

MY LORD,

I Am very sensible, and so are most of the Roman Catholicks of this Kingdom of the many and weighty Obligations we have to your Grace, from the repeated Instances of your Lenity and Goodness, in Matters of the last Consequence to us; which challenge the greatest Return of Acknowledgment, and which, I beg leave to take this Opportunity to make with all the Sense of Gratitude I am Capable of.

A 2

Your

7

## INTRODUCTION.

Your Grace, in the Charitable Address to the Roman Catholicks of Ireland, is pleas'd to leave us at our Liberty, *either of retaining our Principles, or the several Things we profess and practice, if upon a full Examination of them we find them to be right, or in rejecting them in case they shall manifestly appear to be wrong*: It is therefore my Lord, I venture to let your Grace know, that (after perusing said Address with all the Care and Attention I am Master of, and in which, in my humble Opinion, as much is said as can be offer'd upon that Subject) not one of our Principles *manifestly appears to me to be wrong*, but rather, *upon a full Examination find the several Things we profess and practice to be right*, and which I most firmly believe, not out of Obstinacy, Prejudice or Prepossession, but out of a thorough Conviction of Conscience; and am therefore with God's Grace, fully determin'd to retain to my last Breath, being convinc'd that nothing is more odious or abominable to God than double Dealing in the great and weighty Affair of Religion: And to the End it may appear that we are *prepared to give Satisfaction to every one, who asketh us a Reason of the Hope that is in us*, which, as your Grace reminds us, is given us in Charge by St. Peter, 1. Pet. 3. 15. I therefore, tho' not so able for this Undertaking as some others of my Brethren, presume to give Satisfaction to what your Grace asks in the said Address.

And here I declare, My Lord, that if any unguarded or uncivil Expression shall drop from my Pen, which may give just Cause of Offence to your Grace, or may seem to break in upon the Respect and Esteem due to your Grace's Person

## INTRODUCTION.

5

Person and great Merit; I do from this Moment retract it, and desire it may be look'd upon, *Quasi non dictum*, as being far from my Heart and Intention.

Your Grace's first Paragraph being only a pathetick Exhortation to read with Attention and Patience the Charitable Address, I shall proceed to the second; where your Grace is pleased to say: "If you refuse or neglect to enquire in-  
 " to the Ground and Reason of the *Religion*  
 " which you have embrac'd, and the several  
 " Parts and Branches of it, Do not think that  
 " it will excuse you before God at the last Day,  
 " that your Parents or Friends brought you up  
 " in this Religion, which was profess'd by your  
 " Fore-fathers; or that your Spiritual Guides  
 " have thus taught you: For a *Jew*, a *Turk* and  
 " a *Heathen*, may in the same Manner excuse  
 " themselves to all Intents and Purposes as well  
 " as you. God has given you rational Souls;  
 " and if you make use of your own Under-  
 " standing, according to the best of your several  
 " Capacities to preserve your selves, as well  
 " as you can, from those Evils and Calamities  
 " which otherwise might, for want of Care, be-  
 " fall you in this World: Is there not much  
 " more Reason, that you shou'd do the same  
 " where your precious Souls are at Stake?  
 " Look into your own Bibles (if you suspect  
 " the Truth of ours) and there you will find St.  
 " *Peter* himself giving you a Charge, that you  
 " should *always be prepared to give Satisfaction*  
 " *to every one who asketh you a Reason of the*  
 " *Hope that is in you,* 1. *Pet.* 3. 15. In like  
 " Manner St. *Paul* directs you *to prove [or try]*  
 " *all Things, and to hold fast that which is Good.*

## INTRODUCTION.

" 1. *Thess. v. 21.* And St. *John*, in as plain  
 " Words as may be, says unto you and to all  
 " Christians : *Beloved, believe not every Spirit,*  
 " *but try the Spirits, whether they are of God : For*  
 " *that many false Prophets are gone out into the*  
 " *World.* 1. *John. 4. 1.* Many there are, and al-  
 " ways have been, who under the Pretence of  
 " teaching the true Religion, have broached most  
 " pernicious and dangerous Errors : These are  
 " the *false Prophets* of which St. *John* here  
 " speaks : Nor is it possible for any Man to dis-  
 " tinguish them from true Prophets or Teachers,  
 " except he try, examines, and searches into  
 " their Doctrine, that he may thereby find whe-  
 " ther they are guided by the Spirit of God, or  
 " whether they are under a Spirit of Delusion."

My Lord, I hope your Grace will not infer  
 from these Texts of Scripture, that it may be  
 lawful for any private Man, whether learned  
 or unlearned, to try, examin, or search into the  
*Faith once delivered unto the Saints*, or (which  
 is the same Thing) into Articles of Faith defin'd  
 and determin'd by the Church, so as to be al-  
 lowed to prefer his own private Judgment to  
 that of the Church : If so, I must beg leave  
 to differ in Opinion with your Grace : For St.  
*Paul* says expressly : *Tho' we, or an Angel from*  
*Heaven Preach any other Gospel unto you, than*  
*that which we have Preached unto you, Let him*  
*be accursed.* Gal. 1. 8. Thus your own En-  
 glish Version, of which I shall always make use  
 to avoid Misunderstanding. 'Tis true Christ our  
 Saviour doth often recommend to the *Jews* to  
 search the Scriptures and try whether his Do-  
 ctrine and Works were agreeable to the Pro-  
 phesies foretold of the *Messias*, and St. *Luke*,  
Acts



## INTRODUCTION.

7

*Acts 17. 11.* says, *the Bereans were more noble than those of Thessalonica, who received the Word with all Readiness, searching the Scriptures daily whether those things were so.* But then, this was both as to the *Jews* and *Bereans* before they were Baptized, or made Profession of the Faith of Christ: But it is no where said in Scripture, that the Faithful should search the Scriptures, so as that it might be lawful for them to recede from the Faith, if upon their own Examination or Judgment of it, they did not find it agreeable to their Reason. On the contrary, we find, that when the *Jews*, who had received the Faith of Christ, did upon their own private Interpretation of the Law of *Moses*, endeavour to oblige the *Gentiles* converted to Christianity to be Circumcised, and that the Apostles and Priests or Elders assembled in Council, did decree and determine the contrary, with a *Visum est Spiritui Sancto & nobis.* It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us. *Acts 15. 28.* They were so far from allowing either *Jews* or *Gentiles* to examine their Decree, that they delivered the same to them to keep, that is to be executed or observed, as it is expressly recorded by St. Luke, *Acts 16. 4.* In Conformity to this Rule of the Holy Ghost, and of the Apostles, and Elders; their successors the Bishops and Doctors of the Church in Council assembled, have in all Ages, fram'd their Decrees, when any Dispute arose concerning Matters of Faith; and obliged the Faithful, (not to examine their Decrees but) to receive and keep them on Pain of *Anathema* or *Curse*. Thus the Bishops and Doctors assembled in the Council of Nice in the Year 325. decreed,

## INTRODUCTION.

that *Jefus Chrift* was *Consubstantial* with the Father, and pronounced *Anathema* againft *Arius*, and all thofe who did not believe the fame. Thus the firft Council of *Conftantinople* pronounc'd againft *Macedonius* and his Adherents, who did not believe the Divinity of the *Holy Ghoft*. The Council of *Ephesus* againft *Nestorius* for not believing the Virgin *Mary* to be the Mother of God, and for afferting that there were two Persons in *Chrift*. The Council of *Calcedon* againft *Eutyches*, for maintaining that there was but one Nature in *Chrift*: And thus all fucceeding general Councils have decreed and determin'd all Difputes arifing about Matters of Faith, being perfwaded they had the Affiftance of the *Holy Ghoft*, to guide them into all Truth, upon the repeated Promifes of *Chrift* our Saviour to that Purpofe; fo that they might after the Model of the Apoftles and Elders in Council affembled in *Jerufalem*, fay with Regard to their Decrees concerning Matters of Faith: *Visum eft Spiritui Sancto & nobis*. It feemed good to the *Holy Ghoft*, and to us.

But fuppofe, My Lord, I fhould allow (as indeed I cannot) that it may be lawful for all Mankind to fearch the Scripture fo as to make themfelves Judges of the Senfe thereof; how few are there in the World, capable of trying, examining, or fearching into Myfteries of Faith in comparifon of thofe that are not, any other way than by fubmitting their Judgment to that of the Catholic Church; It being evident that there are an Hundred ignorant People in the Chriftian World, for one that is learned, and, that before the Art of Printing was invented, which is not above

## I N T R O D U C T I O N.

9

350 Years since, there were an Hundred that could not even read or write, for one that could? How is it possible then for those ignorant People, many whereof can neither read nor write, and others who can, have neither Leisure nor Time, from the daily Occupations by which they get their Bread, to try, examin, and search into their Doctrine, *that they may thereby find, whether they are guided by the Spirit of God, or whether they are under a Spirit of Delusion?* The ignorant R. Catholick People are, indeed, capable of giving this Reason of *the Hope that is in them*, viz. That their Pastors and Forefathers, from Father to Son, from the Time that Christianity was Planted amongst them, by the Preaching and Miracles of the first Missioners that were sent from Rome hither, taught them the same Faith, which they now Profess, that the New Religions set up in Opposition to it, are not of much more than 200 Years standing; that these same Religions were Introduced not by ignorant, but by Men of Learning, Craft, and immoral Lives, who made a Rupture and *Schism* from the Religion which they (the Catholicks) now Profess; that they are taught to believe in God, to believe in Jesus Christ, his Nativity, his Death, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension; to believe in the Holy Ghost, to believe the Catholick Church, and in Consequence of believing this Catholick Church, to hold and practice the Faith and Morals, which the same Church doth teach them: But if this be not sufficient for their Salvation, what will become of the Generality of Christians? Did Christ Jesus shed his Precious Blood only for a few



## INTRODUCTION.

few learned Men, and abandon the rest of Man-  
 kind, who are not capable of trying, examin-  
 ing, and searching into Texts of Scripture, and  
 comparing them one with another, or diving  
 into profound Myſteries of Faith? God forbid!  
 His infinite Goodneſs has as much Regard for  
 the Soul of the meanest Clown, as for that of  
 the subtlest Philoſopher. He provided for their  
 Salvation after the Manner the most simple, the  
 most natural, and the most adapted to the weak-  
 neſs of their Capacities. He commanded his Ap-  
 ſtles to go and teach all Nations, to baptize  
 them *in the Name of the Father, and of the  
 Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, and to teach them  
 to observe all things whatsoever he had told  
 unto them, on Pain of Damnation: *He that be-  
 lieveth and is baptized shall be saved, but he  
 that believeth not shall be damned.* Mat. Ult.  
 Mar. Ult. Now, for as much as there are many  
 profound Myſteries among all *those Things what-  
 soever*, which even the Learned (much less the  
 ignorant) are not capable to penetrate, the Apo-  
 ſtles guided by the *Holy Ghost*, deliver'd them  
 a *Symbol of Faith or Creed*, which every Man,  
 even of the meanest Capacity that has com-  
 mon Senſe, is capable of getting by Heart and  
 retaining; and which among other Articles, has  
 this: *I believe the holy Catholick Church.* By  
 the Belief of which, he is secure from any Er-  
 ror in Faith, having the Warrant of the Apo-  
 ſtles of Jeſus Chriſt, for believing whatever  
 the Catholick Church shall teach him, even the  
 most sublime Myſteries of Faith: So that he may  
 ſilence the most subtle Philoſopher; who shou'd  
 attempt to shake him in his Faith, or should  
 tell him, he ought not to believe the Myſtery  
 of



# INTRODUCTION.

11

of the *Trinity*, nor *Transubstantiation*, nor the *Mass* nor *Purgatory*: For the ignorant Man may tell him, that the Catholick Church bids him believe these things; that the *Creed* of the Apostles, which he has got by Heart and Retains, bids him believe the Catholick Church; but does not bid him believe the Philosopher.

Thus, I humbly conceive, My Lord, the ignorant People, are exempted from any further Tryal, Examination, or search, than what is consistent with the common Sense and Reason of Mankind; and may rest secure of their Salvation, provided that after Baptism they hold and practice the Articles of the *Creed*, and believe all other things whatsoever which shall be Legally propos'd unto them by the *Catholick Church*, to be held as of Faith.

As to what your Grace adds in the same Paragraph: "It is not enough for a Man to say (as I have heard some of you): I am guided by my spiritual Pastor: I believe as the Church believes, and if I am in Error the Church must Answer for it: The Church is my Hostage, and security with God." &c. I must beg leave to differ in Opinion with your Grace: For I humbly conceive, that bating the Rudeness of the Expression (*the Church must Answer for it*) not only an Ignorant Man, but even the Wisest and the most Learned, could not give a better Answer, or speak more to the Purpose, than by saying, he believes as the Church believes, meaning still the True Church which is but one: For if *Arius*, *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, and other Learned Men had believ'd what the Church believes and professes, and had acquiesced in her Determinations, we should

I N D

## INTRODUCTION.

should not have heard of the many Devastations and Bloodshed History informs us, nor of the loss of so many Millions of Souls which their Heresy and Errors have destroy'd. If they had had the Humility to submit their private Judgment to the Authority of the Church, which is guided by the Holy Ghost, and with whom Christ promis'd to continue to the End of the World, and if others, who in all succeeding Ages to this Time, have left the Church, had done the same; we should have all Liv'd in the Unity of Faith, believing and practicing all the same Things without Hatred, Schism or Division. Nor is this humble Deference to Authority against Reason, but, on the contrary, most Rational; since it is most agreeable to Reason to believe, that what the Church, who has the Divine Assistance, defines and determines to be the true Sense of the Word of God, must rather be so, than what any private Man tho' never so Learned should Judge and determine to the contrary. And that this was the Judgment of all the Wise and Holy Doctors of the Church from the Beginning, we may Learn from that Golden Rule of St. Austin: *Non Scientia Subtilitas, sed Fidei Simplicitas facit Christianum.* And this other Maxim of the same Father, which he so often inculcated against the Manichees: *Non crederem Evangelio, nisi me commoveret Ecclesie Autoritas.* "I would not believe the Gospel, if the Authority of the Church had not moved me to it."

## C H A P. I.

*Of the Baptism of Infants and Persons of Age,  
&c.*

YOur Grace's third and fourth Paragraphs, being only a Recital of the proper Questions put to the Sureties, or God-fathers and God-mothers of Infants, or to Persons who are of Age, when they are Baptiz'd; as namely, whether they believe in God the Father Almighty, and the rest of the Articles of the *Creed* of the Apostles; as also whether they renounce *Satan*, all his Works, and all his Poms; with some short Exhortations to a holy and virtuous Life: To all which Questions the Infants by their Sureties, and the Persons of Age by themselves Answer in the Affirmative, I shall proceed to the fifth Paragraph where your Grace is pleas'd to say: "In the Order for Administ'ring Baptism, as well to Infants, as to Persons who are of Age, as it is set down in the *Roman Ritual*, there are divers things which are Liable to very just Exception; of which I here take no Notice: My only Design at present being (as I have said) to shew what that Faith and Religion is, into which all Members of the Roman Communion are baptiz'd. But as I pass along, I cannot but observe, that when the Priest makes the sign of the Cross upon the Forehead and Breast of such a Convert as I am now speaking of, amongst other Things which he says to him, to Exhort him to a holy Life, he bids him *Abhor Idols, and*  
" *Reject*



## Baptism of Infants

“ reject Images, [*Horresce Idola, respue Simula-*  
 “ *cra,*] which I think is hardly to be reconcil’d  
 “ with the Practice of the Church of Rome,  
 “ or with the Faith which she professes and  
 “ avows : It being expressly made an Article  
 “ of Faith, in that Church, that Honour and  
 “ Veneration is due and to be given to the I-  
 “ mages of Christ, the Virgin Mary and the o-  
 “ ther Saints ; Nor does it appear that the Hea-  
 “ thens themselves paid greater Worship to  
 “ their Images, than what is maintain’d and  
 “ practic’d in those Countries where the Roman  
 “ Religion is Establish’d. Some perhaps will  
 “ tell you, that *Simulacrum* an *Imago* have not  
 “ exactly the same Signification : For answer to  
 “ which, I need only refer you to a *Latin Dicti-*  
 “ *onary*. Or if there should be some small Diffe-  
 “ rence in the Signification of these two Words  
 “ (as I profess I can find none) yet this would be  
 “ but a poor Distinction to rely upon in Matters  
 “ of Faith and Religion, upon which the Salva-  
 “ on of our Souls depends. But I must return  
 “ to the Point which I am now upon.”

*Abhor Idols, reject Images, Horresce Idola,*  
*respue Simulacra* : With humble Submission,  
 My Lord, I think *respue Simulacra* is not well  
 interpreted. Whatever Politick Ends the Com-  
 pilers of *English Dictionarys* may have in ren-  
 dering *Simulacrum* an Image ; I am of Opinion  
 that in the common Acceptation of that Word  
 among Christians, it is taken only for the Statue  
 of false Gods, and that *Idolum*, and *Simulacrum*  
 are one and the same thing. Thus the Words  
 of St. Luke, *Acts* Cap. 7. Ver. 41. *Ei Vitu-*  
*lum fecerunt in Diebus illis, & obtulerunt Hosti-*  
*am Simulacra.* Are rendred in your own English  
 Tran-



Translation. And they made a Calf in those Days, and offer'd Sacrifice unto the Idol. Again, *Acts* Cap. 15. Ver. 20. *Sed scribere ad eos ut abstineant se à Contaminationibus Simulacrorum.* But that we write unto them, that they abstain from Pollutions of Idols. In both which Places the Original Greek has ΕΙΔΩΔΩΝ. Where the Latin has *Simulacrum*. I hope, My Lord, your Grace would not call King George's Statue or Image at *Essex's*-Bridge *Simulacrum*, if you were to make it *Latin*.

And as to the Respect we pay to the Images of Christ and of the Saints, be pleas'd, My Lord, to call to Mind, that at the Dedication (if I may be allow'd that Term) of this Statue, or when the Canvas was taken off it, the Aldermen and Magistrates in their Robes, and the Officers present at the Ceremony, took off their Hats and bowed their Heads towards it, the Soldiers, in the mean Time, firing Vollies of small Shot; And if I may rely upon the Word and Honour of a very worthy *Protestant* Gentleman (who averr'd he was Eye Witness of the Fact) Some Officers of the Army as they marched at the Head of their Men did Salute King *William's* Statue, when they pass'd by it, with the usual Form of turning their Pikes down to the Ground, as is commonly done to Kings and Princes when personally present. Of this Fact I have, indeed, but one Evidence, because I never made it my business to enquire for any; but of the former, I could produce a Thousand. And I am pretty sure, if any Man would presume to offer any Violence or Injury to the said Statues, the Magistrates and Judges of the Land would, very justly, punish him for the same:

This

*Baptism of Infants*

This we had once exemplify'd in the Persons of certain young *Protestant* Gentlemen, who were severely punish'd for some Violence they offer'd to King *William's* Statue. And pray, My Lord, do not these Proceedings manifestly shew, that you yourselves do honour and respect the Monuments of your Benefactors, and look upon the Injuries or Violence offer'd to their Representations, as intended to their Persons? If so, why should it be thought a Crime in us to pay due Honour and Respect to the Monument or Representation of our Redeemer, our best Benefactor, or to the Representations of the Saints, who were the happy Instruments of conveying the Knowledge of our Redemption to us? In a Word, My Lord, the Honour and Respect we pay to the Crucifix, and to the Images of the Saints, is no more than what common Sense and Gratitude suggest to all Men indued with right Reason to practice in their respective Degrees towards their Benefactors in erecting Monuments, and Statues to perpetuate their Memory, and commemorate their Benefits; and which even yourselves practice upon several Occasions. Besides, you kneel down when you receive the Sacrament: You bow your Heads towards the Altar when you approach it, you uncover your Heads when you come into the Church. We do the same. We are all told by *St. Paul*, *Phil.* 2. 10. that at the Name of *Jesus* every Knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth: Is not the Crucifix to the Eye, what the Sound of the Name of *Jesus* is to the Ear? If then ye may kneel down when ye receive the Sacrament, bow down at the Altar, uncover the Head in the

the Church, bow or bend the Knee at the Name of *Jesus*, without any danger of Idolatry; how can we be justly charg'd with that Crime for doing only the very things which you Practice yourselves? Or if the Practice of these things, which, as your Grace very well knows, are only exterior Marks of the Honour and Veneration we pay the *Crucifix*, or the *Images* of *Saints*; and, at the same Time, declare our Intention is only to refer it to the Originals; to *Christ*, as our Redeemer, and to the *Saints*, as the happy Instruments of our Salvation; be Idolatry in us, how will your Grace justify yourselves from the like Impeachment? This I hope, My Lord, may be thought sufficient to vindicate our Church from Idolatry when she gives due Honour and Veneration to the *Images* of *Christ*, the *Virgin Mary*, and the other *Saints*.

In this same Paragraph, your Grace is pleas'd to say: *This is expressly made an Article of Faith in our Church*:

The Catholick Church assembled in the second Council of *Nice*, and the same Church assembled in *Trent*, has declared, that *due Honour and Veneration is to be given to the Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary and the other Saints*, which implies no more than, that the Honour and Veneration which is due to them, is to be given to them. And surely your Grace will not say, that there is no Honour or Veneration due to the Monument of our Redemption, to the Representation of our best Benefactor; when, in our own Days, due Honour and Veneration is paid, (and that without any Crime, or Appearance of Idolatry) to Benefactors of a much inferior Degree. As to what your



## Baptism of Infants

Grace says, that this Doctrine, *viz.* That Honour and Veneration is due, and to be given to the Images of Christ, the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints, is expressly made an Article of Faith in the Church of *Rome*: I think, My Lord, the Church of *Rome*, or (as I suppose your Grace Means) the Church in Communion with the *See* of *Rome*, never pretended to make New Articles of Faith, The only declares and defines the several Points of the *Depositem Fidei* contain'd in the Old and New Testament, or handed down by universal Tradition to be of Faith, and makes them then Terms of Communion when they are question'd or oppos'd. Of these we have many which were never yet defin'd; because they were not oppos'd or deny'd; and yet if any Man shou'd deny them to be Divine Truths revealed by Almighty God, he wou'd be reputed an Heretick: For instance: Suppose a Man should deny what is recorded of *Gideons Fleece*, *Jud. 6. 17. 18.* That it was wet, when the Floor about it was dry; and again, that the Floor was wet, and the Fleece dry; and that in Process of time, this Man should continue obstinate, or bring over any Number of Christians to his Opinion, so as to disturb the Peace of the Church, and infect others with his Error; the Catholick Church, no doubt, would condemn him and his Sectators as Hereticks. And thus it was when the *Iconoclasts*, in the latter End of the Eighth Century, broke down the Images of Jesus Christ and of his Saints, and maintain'd that no Honour or Respect should be paid them: the second Council of *Nice* declar'd the *Iconoclasts* Hereticks: And in like manner in the Beginning of the sixteenth Century, when



when Martin Luther, John Calvin, and others reviv'd the same; the Council of Trent declar'd against them, and decreed that *Honour and Veneration is due and to be given to the Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the other Saints*. This they declar'd to be *de Fide*, as being handed down unto them in all Ages, and practis'd by the Piety of the Christians, warranted by the Scriptures, and authoris'd by the Catholick Church, and the ancient Holy Fathers: Nor would this have been inserted in the Creed of Pope Pius (as your Grace is pleas'd to call it) or made a Term of Communion, as many other pious Practices of the Church are not, because they were not oppos'd; if those Gentlemen and their Sectators had not attempted to abolish it. The Council of Trent doth then declare it to be *de Fide*, that *Honour and Veneration is due and to be given to the Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary and other Saints*. Because it would not suffer any Part of the *Depositem Fidei* to be taken away, or any of the pious Practices, which put us in mind of our Redemption, or of our Respect to God or his Saints; but doth not pretend to make a new Article of Faith (as your Grace is pleas'd to say) otherwise than as afore-said.

---

## CHAP. II.

### Of Idolatry.

**Y**Our Grace adds, *ibid.* "Nor does it appear that the Heathens themselves paid greater Worship to their Images, than what is maintain'd and practis'd in those Countries,

## Of Idolatry.

"where the Roman Religion is establish'd." This, My Lord, is very hard indeed. But to give your Grace Satisfaction, and shew that we are not Idolaters, I shall endeavour to lay down: First, *what that Idolatry is wherewith the Scripture so often charges the Heathens, and your Grace, us, the Roman Catholicks.* Secondly, *what the Nature of it is, and wherein it doth consist.* And lastly, *what exterior Actions of Men, are Idolatry, and how they are to be distinguish'd from other Actions in themselves commendable, innocent or indifferent.*

First, *What that Idolatry is wherewith the Scripture so often charges the Heathens, and your Grace, the Roman Catholicks.*

This I take to be, not their making any graven or carv'd Images, or Similitudes of Things in Heaven or on Earth, or in the Waters; but their making these things to themselves in Order to adore or worship them as their Gods: For the Scripture does not forbid the making of Images or Representations of Things in Heaven or on Earth, as is plainly to be seen by the Command which God gave *Moses* to make two *Cherubins* to be plac'd over the *Ark*; and from the Conduct of *Solomon*, who caused to be made, and placed several Figures and Representations of Things in Heaven, and on Earth in the Temple of Jerusalem. But the Scripture only forbids the making of these Things to themselves, that is to make them their Gods. For the Scripture doth not say: *Thou shalt not make* (to use your own Version) *any graven Image, &c.* But, *thou shalt not make to thyself any graven Image, &c.* *Exod. Chap.*

Now, My Lord, if making, carving, casting, or painting Images be (in your Grace's Opinion) Idolatry, I am sure those of your Communion are not qualify'd to throw the first Stone at the Roman Catholicks: For it is too visible to be deny'd, that you have in many Places Figures, Images, and Representations of Things on Earth, and in Heaven, and I my self can aver, that I have seen in the great Church of St. *Albans* in England two Pictures, one of each Side of the great Altar, representing *Moses* as Law-giver, and *Aaron* as High-Priest with his *Censer* in his hand: Why therefore, My Lord, may not the *Crucifix* or Image of our great Redeemer, Law-giver and high-Priest *Jesus Christ*, be as warrantably placed in our Church.

Secondly, *What the Nature of this Idolatry is, and wherein it doth consist.*

I believe your Grace, will not refuse to agree with me, that Idolatry (in the proper Signification of the Word) is the giving unto any Creature, the Honour, Worship, or Adoration, which is due only to God; and that, under the Notion of his being alone the Maker and Creator of all things, and consequently of our selves; and that therefore a supreme Worship and Adoration is so due to him, that if the same be given to any Creature whatsoever, such an Action is properly Idolatry.

Lastly, *What exterior Actions of Men are Idolatry, and how they are to be distinguish'd from other Actions in themselves Commendable, innocent or indifferent.*

I know not whether I may hope for your Grace's Concurrence with me in Opinion, on this Head, as I flatter'd my self I may on the two



## Of Idolatry.

Former; however, I'll take the Liberty to say, that the distinguishing Notes, Marks or Characteristicks of Idolatry from other Actions in themselves commendable, innocent or indifferent, consist in kneeling, prostrating, worshipping, &c. As to a Deity, or offering Sacrifice to any but to the only true God. And this I take to be so, because kneeling to, prostrating before, or kissing God's Creatures, according to the different Excellencies we conceive in, or the Duty and Obligation we owe unto them, is what is so frequently and expressly recommended unto us in the Holy Scriptures.

We are commanded to honour Kings, Princes, and Magistrates, to give *Tribute to whom Tribute is due, and Honour to whom Honour is due.* In consequence whereof we give our Petitions and Prayers to Kings and Sovereign Princes upon our Knees, and kiss their Hands: Nay we may, by Scripture warrant, worship them with the same external Act, wherewith we Worship God. As appears by this Text: *And David said to all the Congregation, now bless the Lord your God. And all the Congregation bles'd the Lord God of their Fathers, and bow'd down their Heads, and worshipp'd the Lord and the King.* 1. Chron. 29. 20 Here the People worshipp'd God and the King with the same Act, viz. God as their supreme Lord, and the King as his Vicegerent.

We are also commanded to bend the Knee, at the Name of Jesus, and by consequence may lawfully do the same at the Figure or Image of Jesus: Since the Figure or Image of Jesus is to the Eye, what the sound of the word Jesus is to the Ear, I hope your Grace will also allow, that



that to uncover the Head in Churches, to bow down at the Altar, to take the Sacrament kneeling, to kiss the Book of the Gospels are innocent Practices, since you do these things yourselves : So that here is uncovering the Head, bowing, kneeling, kissing, honouring worshipping the Creatures of Almighty God without any danger of Idolatry, upon the best Warrant we can proceed in any Action of humane Life.

Idolatry then, properly speaking, consists in performing or practicing any of the aforesaid Actions to Idols, or the Representation of false Gods, in offering Sacrifice to them, or confiding in them ; or even in offering Sacrifice to Saints or Angels, or to the Images or Representations of Saints or Angels, or even of Jesus Christ himself ; as believing the Saints or Angels to have any Divinity in them, or to be able to forgive us our Sins, other than to obtain that from God, by their Prayers and Intercession for us.

Now, I call upon your Grace to make out, when we bend the Knee, or bow, or kiss the Representations, or Images of Jesus Christ, or of those of his Saints or Angels, that we believe any Diviny or Power in them, of their own Nature, to forgive us our Sins, or that we offer Sacrifice unto them. On the contrary, we perform all the aforesaid Actions relatively, because the said Representations excite in our Minds Sentiments of Gratitude, first to our Saviour Jesus Christ, by whose Doctrine, Death, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension we hope to be sav'd ; and next, to his Saints, who were the happy Instruments of conveying unto us the Knowledge of him and of his Doctrine. So that in effect this Honour is paid to no other but to Jesus Christ himself.

And for as much as I believe, your Grace has a great Veneration for St. *Austin*, becaule he was a learned Doctor of the Church, and very well versed in the Belief and Practice both of his own and of the preceding Ages; I shall beg leave to insert here a Passage taken out of his 20th. Book, Cap. 21. *Contra Faustum Manicheum*, who seem'd to reproach the Christians, much after the same Manner as your Grace is pleas'd to reproach the Roman Catholicks; telling them they took away the Idols indeed, but substituted the Martyrs in their Room; to which this Holy Father returns an Answer in these Words.

" Nam quod etiam hinc nobis calumniatur *Fau-*  
 " *stus*, quod Martyrum Memorias honoramus,  
 " in hoc dicens nos Idola convertisse, non tam  
 " me movet, ut huic Calumniæ respondeam,  
 " quam ut ipsum *Faustum* ostendam Studio Ca-  
 " lumniandi etiam ab ipsius *Manichæi* Vanita-  
 " tibus exorbitare voluisse, & in vulgarem atque  
 " Poeticam Paganorum Opinionem à quibus se  
 " alienissimum cupit videri, nescio, quomodo in-  
 " cautum incidisse. Cum enim dixisset, nos ver-  
 " tisse Idola in Martyres, quos *Votis*, inquit, *Si-*  
 " *milibus colitis, Defunctorum Umbras Vinopla-*  
 " *catis & Dapibus* : Sunt ergo Umbræ Defunc-  
 " torum? Nunquam hoc in vestrīs Sermonibus  
 " audivimus; nunquam in Litteris legimus: I-  
 " mo contradicere soletis talibus Opinionibus,  
 " afferentes Animas Mortuorum Malas minúsque  
 " purgatas, aut in Revolutiones ire, aut in gra-  
 " viores aliquas Pœnas; bonas autem in Naves  
 " imponi, & in Cœlo navigantes transire hinc,  
 " in illud Phantasma Terræ Luminis, pro qua  
 " pugnando perierant: Ita nullas Animas circa  
 " suorum Corporum sepulchra detineri: Unde  
 " igitur

igitur Umbræ Defunctorum? Quæ Substantia  
 Earum, qui Locus? Sed maledicendi Cupiditate  
*Faustus* quid profiteretur, oblitus est: Aut for-  
 tè dormitans Umbras somniando dictavit, nec,  
 cum Verba sua legeret, evigilavit: Populus  
 autem Christianus Memorias Martyrum religi-  
 oſa Sollemnitate concelebrat, & ad excitandam  
 Imitationem, & ut Meritis eorum confocietur,  
 atque Orationibus adjuvetur: Ita tamen ut  
 Nulli Martyrum, ſed ipſi Deo Martyrum,  
 quamvis in Memorijs Martyrum, conſtituamus  
 Altaria. Quis enim Antiliticum in Locis Sanc-  
 torum Corporum aſſiſtens Altari, aliquando  
 dixit; Offerimus tibi *Petre*, aut *Paule*, aut  
*Cypriane*: Sed quod offertur, offertur Deo qui  
 Martyres coronavit apud Memorias eorum  
 quos coronavit; ut ex ipſorum Locorum Ad-  
 monitione major Affectus exſurgat, ad acuen-  
 dam Charitatem, & in illos quos imitari poſſu-  
 mus, & in illum, quo Adjuvante, poſſumus.  
 Colimus ergo Martyres eo Cultu Dilectionis  
 & Societatis, quo & in hac Vita Coluntur  
 Sancti Homines Dei, quorum Cor ad talem  
 pro Evangelica Veritate Paſſionem paratum  
 eſſe ſentimus. Sed illos tanto devotiùs, quan-  
 to ſecuriùs poſt Certamina ſuperata: Quanto  
 etiam fidentiore Laude prædicamus, jam in  
 Vita feliciore Victores, quam in iſta adhuc  
 uſque pugnantes. At illo Cultu, quæ Græcè  
*Latreia* dicitur, Latine uno Verbo dici non  
 poteſt, cum ſit quædam propriè Divinitati  
 debita ſervitus, nec colimus nec colendum do-  
 cemus, niſi unum Deum, Cum autem ad hunc  
 Cultum pertineat Oblatio Sacrificij, unde Ido-  
 latria dicitur eorum, qui hoc etiam Idolis ex-  
 hibent, nullo modo tale aliquid offerimus,  
 aut



“ aut offerendum præcipimus, vel cuiquam Martyri, vel cuiquam Sanctæ Animæ, vel cuiquam Angelo: Et quisquis in hunc Errorem delabitur, corripitur per sanam Doctrinam, sive ut corrigatur, sive ut caveatur.”

For as to the Calumny cast on us by Faultus, because we honour the Memory of the Martyrs, saying: *We have chang'd the Idols into Martyrs*, I am not so much concern'd to answer it, as I am to shew that Faultus himself has, out of a desire of Calumniating, exceeded the Follies of Manichæus himself, and has unwarily, I know not how, fallen in with the Vulgar and Poetical Opinion of the Pagans, from which he covets to be thought very much averse. For when he had said, that we have chang'd the Idols into Martyrs, whom you worship, says he, with like Service, and appease the shades of the Dead with Wine and Meats: There are then shades of the Dead. This we never heard in your Sermons, never read in your Writings: Nay ye use to contradict such Opinions, asserting that the evil Souls of the Dead, and those that are less purify'd either go into\* Revolutions, or into some more grievous Pains; that the good Souls are put into Ships, and sailing to Heaven, pass hence into that Phantom of Land of Light, in fighting for which they died: No Souls then are detain'd about the Sepulchers of their Bodies: Whence then come the shades of the Dead? What is their Substance, what their Place? But Faultus out of a Desire of speaking Evil forgets what he professeth. Or perhaps, as he slept, he wrote Shades in his Dream, nor did he awake when he read his own Words. The Christian People indeed do celebrate the Memory of the Martyrs, with a Religious

\* Transmigration.



gious Solemnity, both to excite themselves to an Imitation of the Martyrs, to have a share in their Merits, and be assisted by their Prayers. Yet so as not to erect Altars to any Martyr, but to the very God of Martyrs tho' in the \* Memories of the Martyrs. For who of the Prelates assisting at the Altar in the Places of the Body's of the Saints ever said : We offer unto thee O Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian ? But that which is offer'd, is offer'd to God, who crown'd the Martyrs, at the Memories of the Martyr's whom he crown'd ; to the End that being admonish'd by those Places, a greater Desire may be stir'd up in them, both to whet their Love towards them, whom we may imitate, and towards † him by whose Help, we † God. shall be able to imitate them. We worship then the Martyrs with that Worship of Love and Fellowship wherewith the Holy Men of God are worshipp'd in this Life, whose Hearts we perceive to be prepar'd to suffer the like Passion for the Truth of the Gospel. But the Martyrs we worship so much the more devoutly, by, how much we may, do it with more security after their Victory; and by how much we may with a more confident Praise extol them, as Victors in a happy Life, than those as yet fighting in this. But with that Worship, which in Greek is call'd *Latreia*, but in Latin cannot be express'd in one Word; since it is a certain Service properly due to the Divinity; we neither worship nor teach to be worshipp'd but one God. And whereas unto this Worship appertains the Oblation of a Sacrifice, whence Idolatry is said to be committed by those who exhibit it to Idols, we do by no Means offer any such, or command to be offer'd, either to any Martyr, or to any holy Soul, or to any Angel : And  
whoever

\* Altars on which the Relicks of the Martyrs were placed.

## *Of the Pope's Supremacy.*

*whoever falls into this Error, he is check'd by wholesome Doctrine, in order to be corrected, or to be avoided.*

Now, My Lord, I beg leave to ask your Grace, whether St. *Austin* doth not justify our Practice, with Respect to the worship we exhibit to Martyrs, and Saints, in order to obtain for us, Help and Assistance from God in our Necessities? And whether St. *Austin* was not a competent witness of the Practice of the whole Catholick Church of his Time? Or whether he himself would not rather condemn and abhor such a Practice, if he had not believ'd it to have been lawful, and the Sense of the whole Catholick Church? And if it was good and Orthodox when he liv'd, now thirteen hundred Years ago, why not so in our Days?

---

### C H A P. III.

#### *Of the Pope's Supremacy.*

**I**N the sixth Paragraph, your Grace returns again to the Questions put by the Priest, and the Answers made by the Convert. In the seventh you are pleas'd to tell us, that what you have faithfully extracted out of our Rituals, "is sufficient to shew what that Faith and Religion is, upon the Profession of which alone, every Person is, by the Sacrament of Baptism to be admitted as a Member of our Church: And when an Infant is brought to be Baptized, his Sureties in his Name make the very same, and no other Profession."

In

In the eight Paragraph, your Grace goes on thus : " Now here I beseech you to observe, that in all this, there is not the least Word or Intimation of the Pope or his Supremacy, of the Pre-eminence of the Church of Rome; above all other Churches, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Worshipping of the Host, the Communion under one Kind, or Species alone, the Doctrine of Purgatory, with Masses and Prayers for the Dead; Indulgences, Praying to Saints, worshipping of Images and Relicks; the Number of seven Sacraments, and neither more or fewer, Auricular Confession to a Priest, Penance, Pilgrimages; Or of any Point whatever, which at this Time, is controverted between you and us. If then neither the Profession nor Belief of any of these things is required as necessary to qualify any Man to be Baptized and received as a true Member of Christ's Church : Is it not most proper for you to examin and demand by what Authority they are impos'd upon you to be believ'd and receiv'd as necessary to Salvation ? Can any thing be necessary to Salvation, which God ( the only Author and giver of Salvation ) does not require from us ? Or if God does thus require the Belief and Profession of these Things from us, why are they not expressed, or at least sufficiently imply'd in that Profession which every Christian is required either in his own Person, or if he be an Infant ) by his Sureties to make when he is received as a Member of Christ's Church by Baptism."

The

## Of the Pope's Supremacy.

The Doctrine of this Paragraph, My Lord, may possibly be of some weight with People, who do not sift well the Matter, because it carries a plausible Colour, but with humble Submission, I believe it will not be so with such as dive to the bottom of it. Your Grace desires us to observe, that in the Profession of Faith to be made at *Baptism*, either by Infants or Persons of Age, there is not the least Word or Intimation of the *Pope* or his *Supremacy*, &c. No, My Lord, there is not: Nor of the *Consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father: Nor whether the three Persons in the Trinity be really distinct one from another, and consist of one only Nature, nor that the Holy Ghost is to be adored with the Father and the Son, or proceedeth from the Father and the Son: Nor that the Virgin *Mary* is the Mother of God: Nor that *Jesus Christ* consists of two Natures, the Divine and Human: Nor that he hath two distinct Wills, and yet whoever would deny (or refuse to give his assent to) these Points and many others which your Grace holds as well as we, would be reputed an Heretick, as were formerly the *Arians*, the *Maccedonians*, the *Nestorians*, the *Eutychians*, the *Monothelites*, and many others for other Points, which, your Grace, believes to be Hetherodox as well as the Church of *Rome*. The *Arians* did frequently urge your Grace's Argument. They professed to believe and practice all the Articles contained in the Apostles Creed, they Answer'd all the Questions put in our Rituals, in the affirmative, and even went a Step further, so as to believe the *Nicene Creed*, provided the Word *ὁμοῦσιος* were put instead of *ὁμοῦσιος*, which differ only in an iota, as appears by



by many of their Formula's of Faith. The Nestorians professed to believe and practice all the Articles of that of Nice, but deny'd, that the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God: They own'd she was Θετόκος, but not Θεοτόκος, tho' the two Words differ only in sound, or in the place of the Accent or Apex; yet for as much as Christ Jesus has declared that: † *lota unum aut* † Mat. 3. *unus apex non prateribit a Lege donec omnia* 18. *fiant.* One For or one Tittle shall not pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled, they were both declar'd Hereticks, the Arians for adding the *lota*, and the Nestorians for changing or misplacing the Apex or Tittle.

In like Manner, tho' there be not the least Word or Intimation of the Pope, or his Supremacy; of the Pre-eminence of the Church of Rome above all other Churches, of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. Mention'd in the Roman Ritual, yet all these Points being Part of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church are no less to be held and believed than those other Points expressed in the said Ritual; after the same Manner, as the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, or the Distinction of the three Persons in one Nature, or, that the Holy Ghost is to be adored with the Father and the Son, or that the Virgin Mary is the Mother of God, &c. Are to be held and believed, tho' there be not the least Word or Intimation of them in the ancient Rituals for Baptism.

But, My Lord, is there no Intimation of the Pope or his Supremacy, or of the other Points mention'd by your Grace, in the Scripture, or in the Works of the Holy Fathers, who living  
near

## Of the Pope's Supremacy.

near the Times of the Apostles were the best Expositors of the Sense of the Scripture? I think, My Lord, you will find there is, if your Grace will please to Read the following, Texts; and hold with all Antiquity, that the Pope is St. Peter's Successor. *Mat. 10. 2.* "Duodecem autem Apostolorum Nomina sunt hæc. Primus, *Simon qui dicitur Petrus, &c.*" *Now the Names of the twelve Apostles are these, the first Simon who is call'd Peter, &c. Mat. Cap. 16. v.v. 18. 19.* "Tu es Petrus, & super hanc Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, & Portæ Inferni non prævalebunt adversus eam, & tibi dabo Claves Regni Coelorum, & Quodcumque ligaveris super Terram, erit ligatum & in Coelis. Et quodcumque solveris super Terram, erit solutum & in Coelis." *Thou art Peter (that is, a Rock) and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it: And unto thee I will give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven: And whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. Luke, Cap. 22. v.v. 31, 32.* "Simon, *Simon, ecce Satanas expetivit vos, ut cribraret sicut Triticum: ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat Fides tua: Et tu aliquando conversus, confirma Fratres tuos.*" *Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired you, that he might sift you as Wheat: But I have prayed for thee that thy Faith fail not, and when thou art Converted, confirm thy Brethren. St. John. Chap. 21. v.v. 15, 16. 17.* "Dicit Simoni Petri Jesus: *Simon Joannis diligis me plus his? Dicit ei: Etiam Domine, tu scis quia amo te. Dicit ei: Pasce Agnos Meos. Dicit ei iterum: Simon Jo-*

*nis*

" *nīs diligis me?* Ait illi: Etiam Domine tu scis  
 " quia amo te. Dicit ei: Pasce Agnos meos. Di-  
 " cit ei tertio *Simon Joannis*, amas me? Contris-  
 " tatus est *Petrus*, quia dixit ei tertio, amas me?  
 " Et dixit ei Domine tu omnia nostri: Tu scis quia  
 " amo te. Dixit ei: Pasce Oves meas?" *Jesus*  
*saieth to Simon Peter: Simon Son of Jonas, lovest*  
*thou me more than these?* He *saieth unto him:*  
*Yes Lord thou knowest that I Love thee.* He  
*saieth unto him: Feed my Lambs.* He *saieth to*  
*him again: Simon Son of Jonas lovest thou me?*  
*He saith unto him: Yes Lord, thou knowest,*  
*that I love thee: He saith unto him: Feed my*  
*Lambs, He saith unto him the third time: Simon*  
*Son of Jonas, lovest thou me?* Peter was grieved,  
*because he said unto him the third time, lovest*  
*thou me?* And he said unto him: Lord thou  
*knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love thee.*  
*He saith unto him, feed my Sheep.* By this Me-  
 taphor of Lambs and Sheep, (as I hope your  
 Grace will allow) is undoubtedly meant both the  
 Laity and the Clergy, that is Bishops, Priests,  
 and Deacons, as well as Lay People.

Now that the Supremacy and Pre-eminence of  
 St. Peter, and consequently of his Successors the  
 Popes or Bishops of Rome (the other Points  
 mention'd by your Grace shall be hereafter con-  
 sider'd) are manifestly establish'd by Christ, ap-  
 pears from these Texts of Scripture. That St.  
 Peter in his own Person exercis'd this Pre-emi-  
 nence appears by many Instances recorded in the  
 1st. 2d. 3d. 4th. 5th. and several other Chapters  
 of the Acts of the Apostles. That he appointed  
 and ordained *Evdodius* Bishop of *Antioch*, and  
 sent St. *Mark* from Rome to *Alexandria* in  
*Egypt*: That he shed his Blood, and died upon



*Of the Pope's Supremacy.*

a Cross after the Example of his Master, in that Capital City of the World, appears by the unanimous Consent of all the ancient Historians. That his Successors the Bishops of *Rome* did, in like Manner, exercise the same Pre-eminence over all the Bishops of the *East* and *West*; and even received the Appeals of the very Patriarchs of the *East*, and restored them to their *Sees* when injured, and wrongfully cast out, appears by many Instances recorded in the History of the Church; that the ancient Fathers and Holy Doctors of the Church, did always understand and expound the abovesaid Texts of Scripture to the same Purpose, so as to believe that Christ our Saviour did appoint St. *Peter* and his Successors to be the Center of Unity, in order to regulate as universal Head, and to influence all the particular Churches in the World; it being morally impossible for any Harmony or Concord to be among the Members of so vast a Body, except there be a Center or Fountain-Head to which they must have recourse, in order to determine their Differences, in the last resort; nor cou'd they think, that Christ had used less Prudence in the Constitution of his Church, than common Legislators do in that of petty Commonwealths; which, as common Sense and Reason suggest, cannot subsist without Subordination, to some supreme Magistrate finally to determine Differences; but must else resolve into Anarchy and Confusion. That these, I say, were the Sentiments of the ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Church, appears by innumerable Passages, which I might borrow from their Writings and Commentaries; but to save your Grace the Trouble of reading so many, I shall instance only in four or five.

St.



## Of the Pope's Supremay.

35

St. Ireneus, the Disciple of St. Policarp the Disciple of St. John the Evangelist, Lib. 3. *adversus Hareses* Cap. 3. speaking of the Church of Rome: says, "Quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali Volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare Successiones, maximæ, & antiquissimæ, & omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Romæ fundatæ & constitutæ Ecclesiæ, eam, quam habet ab Apostolis Traditionem, & annunciatam Homini-bus Fidem per Successionem Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad Nos indicantes, confundimus eos, qui quoquomodo, vel per sui placentiam malam, vel vanam Gloriam, vel Cœcitatem, & malam Sententiam, præterquam oportet, colligunt: Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter potentio-rem Principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam." For as much as it would be tedious, in such a Volume as this, to enumerate the Successions of all the Churches; when we shew the Succession of the greatest, and the most ancient, and best known unto all Men, that which was founded and establish'd in Rome, by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, and declare the Tradition which it holds from the Apostles, and the Faith publish'd unto Men by the Succession of Bishops coming down even unto us, we confound those, who in a Manner, either by their evil Pleasure, or vain Glory, or Blindness, or bad Opinion, infer what they ought not: For unto this Church, every Church must have Recourse, by Reason of it's more powerful Principality.

Tertulian an ancient Father and Contemporary to St. Ireneus, Lib. de Pudicitia, Cap. 1, C 2 faith,

\* Mean-  
ing the  
Bishop of  
Rome.

saith, " Audio etiam Edictum esse Propositum  
" & quidem Peremptorium: Pontifex scilicet  
" Maximus, \* Episcopus Episcoporum dicit: E-  
" go & Mæchiæ & Fornicationis Delicta Peni-  
" tentia Functis dimitto." *I hear there is an  
Edict set forth, and that peremptory; the chief  
Pontiff, the Bishop of Bishops saith: I forgive  
the Crimes of Adultery and Fornication to those  
who have done Penance for these Sins.*

St. Cyprian Martyr and Bishop of Carthage,  
who died about the Year, 250. *Lib. de Unit.  
Eccles.* hath these Words: " Hoc erant utique,  
" & Cæteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari Con-  
" sortio Præditi, & Honoris & Potestatis, sed  
" Exordium ab Unitate proficiscitur, Primatus  
" Petro Datur, ut una Christi Ecclesia, & Cathe-  
" dra una Monstretur." *The rest of the Apo-  
stles were the same as Peter, vested with a like  
Fellowship both of Honour and Power; but a  
Beginning proceeds from Unity: The Primacy  
is given to Peter, that it might appear the Church  
of Christ was one, and the Chair one.*

St. Jerome who was deservedly stiled *Magister  
Mundi*, *Lib. i. adv. Jovin.* writes thus of St.  
Peter's Primacy: " Ideo inter duodecim unus  
" eligitur, ut Capite constituto Schismatis tolla-  
" tur Occasio." *Therefore among the twelve one  
is chosen, that a Head being appointed the Cause  
of Schism might be removed.*

St. Austin, *Lib. uno, Contra Epist. Fund. Cap.*  
4. " Ut ergo hanc omitam Sapientiam quam  
" in Ecclesia esse Catholica non creditis, multa  
" sunt alia quæ in ejus Gremio me justissimè te-  
" neant. Tenet Consensus Populorum atque  
" Gentium: Tenet Autoritas Miraculis in-  
" choata, spe nutrita, Charitate Aucta, Vetuf-  
" tate

“ tate firmata : Tenet ab ipsa sede Petri Apo-  
 “ stoli, cui pascendas Oves suas post Resurrecti-  
 “ onem Dominus commendavit, usque ad præ-  
 “ sentem Episcopatum successio Sacerdotum :  
 “ Tenet postremò ipsum Catholicæ Nomen, quod  
 “ non sine Causa inter tam multas Hæreses sic ista  
 “ Ecclesia sola obtinuit, ut cum omnes Hære-  
 “ tici se Catholici dici velint ; quærenti tamen  
 “ Perigrino alicui, ubi ad Catholicam convenia-  
 “ tur, nullus Hæreticorum, vel Basilicam suam  
 “ vel Domum audeat ostendere.”

*Not to speak then of that Wisdom which you do not believe to be in the Catholick Church, there are many other things which most justly keep me in her Bosome. The Consent of People and Nations keeps me in it. The Authority begun by Miracles, nourish'd by Hope, increased by Charity, and confirmed by Antiquity keeps me in it : The Succession of Prelates, from the Seat of St. Peter the Apostle to whom Christ committed his Flock after his Resurrection, to him who at present sits on his Chair, keeps me in it : In fine, the very Name of Catholick, which not without Reason, amidst so many Heresies this Church alone has so obtained, that whereas all Hereticks would be called Catholicks, yet if any Stranger should ask where the Catholicks assemble, no Heretick dare shew his own Church or House.*

I think, My Lord, it is plain by the Doctrine of these holy and ancient Fathers of the Church, that, tho' there be not a Word, nor the least Intimation of the Pope or his Supremacy in our Rituals for Baptism, yet that both are very well founded in Scripture, and in Antiquity. These Holy Fathers were Men of great Piety, Zeal, and Know-  
 ledge,



ledge; they were Stars of the first Magnitude, Luminaries of the Christian World, upon whose Authority alone, We may safely pronounce, tho' we had no other Grounds to proceed upon. But of this enough.

---

#### CHAP. IV.

##### *Of the Articles to be professed in Baptism.*

**I**N the Ninth Paragraph your Grace tells us, the only Answer the Catholicks make to what your Grace in the Eight Paragraph desires them to observe (*viz.* That there is no Intimation of the Pope or his Supremacy, &c. in our Rituals for Baptism) is, that tho' those things are not there expressed; yet they are sufficiently imply'd in that one Article of the Catholick Church, which makes a Part of the Apostle's Creed. To this your Grace is pleas'd to reply in these Words: "But if this be a good Answer, what  
 " Necessity can there be for a Christian, at the  
 " Time of his Baptism, or indeed at any other  
 " Time, to make Profession of any other Article of Faith beside this *of the Holy Catholick Church*, in which (according to this Doctrine)  
 " all the rest are sufficiently imply'd and contain'd? Or if it be necessary that a Christian,  
 " at the Time of his Baptism, or his Sureties for him, should make Profession of some other Articles of Faith besides this one; why not of  
 " all of them? Or what Reason can be given, why the Profession of Faith, publish'd by  
 " Pope Pius the 4th. in the Year 1564. and  
 " now universally receiv'd, and own'd by the  
 " Church



“ Church of Rome, as the true Catholick Faith,  
 “ out of which none can be saved, (as it is there  
 “ expressed) why this Profession of Faith (I say)  
 “ should not every Article of it be made at  
 “ the time of Baptism? Indeed the matter  
 “ seems very plainly to speak for it self; that  
 “ great Numbers of learned Men, of the Roman  
 “ Communion know very well, that the latter  
 “ part of Pope *Pius's* Profession of Faith,  
 “ which we Reject, was no part of the Faith of  
 “ the ancient Church, and therefore the Gover-  
 “ nours of your Church, dare not make it a  
 “ Part of the Baptismal Profession, lest by such  
 “ an Innovation, they should give Occasion for  
 “ a Schism among your selves, which every  
 “ Man may see would soon be the Consequence  
 “ of the Introduction of such a Practice.”

There are many Reasons, My Lord, why an  
 Infant by his Sureties, or a Person of Age for  
 himself, should at his Baptism make Profession of  
 some other Articles of Faith (tho' not of all of  
 them) beside this of the *Catholick Church*.

First, because *ancient Forms* are sacred things,  
 of which the *Catholick Church* is very tenaci-  
 ous, and therefore will not Alter them. Second-  
 ly, because there are some Articles of Faith,  
 which, as your Grace knows very well, are *de*  
*Necessitate Medij*, that is, the express Professi-  
 on, of which is necessary for Salvation. (save  
 only Cases of Necessity) And of those, some must  
 be professed publicly before *Baptism*, accord-  
 ing to the different Capacities of the Persons to  
 be Baptized, or the Exigencies of their Cir-  
 cumstances; so as that none ought to be Bap-  
 tized except he first makes publick Profession of  
 one or more of the chief Articles of the Christi-

an Faith, either by himself, or his Sureties: This is so true, that, as we read *Acts*, Chap 8. V.V. 36, 37. *Philip* would not baptize the *Eunuch* of the *Queen of Candace*, till he had first made Profession that *Jesus Christ* was the Son of God: *See here is Water* (saith the *Eunuch*) *what doth hinder me to be Baptized?* And *Philip* said, *if thou believest with all thy Heart thou mayst.* And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*

Here, it is to be observed, that when *Philip* said: *If thou believest with all thine Heart*, he did not mean that the *Eunuch* should not be oblig'd to believe any more of the Doctrine of the Gospel, than that single Article: *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* And yet we don't find that he required of him in Order to be baptized to make open Profession of any other Article. Lastly, because it would be too tedious and irksome to the Sureties and Assistants at Baptism, to express and recite all the Articles and points of Faith; and even unnecessary, since scarce any are now baptized but Infants of whom Care is taken, and Teachers provided, as they grow in Years, to instruct them, not only in their Faith, but also in moral Duties. In the primitive Times, indeed, when the *Pagans* were coming very thick into the Church, there was a great deal of pains taken to instruct their *Adults*, or Persons of Age, whom they call'd *Catechumens*, not only in the Articles contain'd in our Rituals, but also in all other Points of Faith and Morals, and particularly in what they were to believe, and hold concerning the blessed Sacrament, of which I find no mention in any *baptismal Ritual* that ever I read. It is not there;

therefore necessary we should Require of Infants or their Sureties nor of Persons of Age to make at Baptism a distinct Profession of all the Articles and Points of the Catholick Faith; since by professing the principal and chiefest Articles, namely believing in God, in Jesus Christ, in the Holy Ghost, believing the Catholick Church, they profess to believe all the Doctrine which the Catholick Church shall teach them. Nor is it enough to profess at Baptism, that only Article. *I believe the Catholick Church*: Since as it is above said, it is necessary, *Necessitate Medij* (bating Cases of Necessity) to profess some more or less, of the chiefest Articles of the Christian Faith.

As to what your Grace says in the Close of this Paragraph, that the Reason why the latter part of the Profession of Faith publish'd by Pope *Pius* the 4th. is not made at the time of Baptism, "is, because great Numbers of learned Men of the Roman Communion know very well, that it was no part of the Faith of the ancient Christian Church" I must beg leave to differ in Opinion with your Grace: For I never read nor heard that any Man learned or unlearned of the Roman Communion did ever say, that it was no part of the Faith of the ancient Christian Catholick Church. But the Reason why Pope *Pius* the 4th. joyn'd that latter Part to the Former, was that it might be a Test of the sincerity of those, who either come over to the Catholick Church from Heresy, or who are prefer'd to the Care of Souls, or to other Dignities in the Church. And pray, My Lord, is not the self same Thing practis'd in your own Church? You have your Thirty-nine Articles, and



and several other Canons and Constitutions, consented unto and Decree'd in your *National* and *Provincial* Councils, and to the strict Belief and Practice of all the Articles in them contain'd, your Arch Bishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons are Required to Swear and Subscribe. It may not be amiss to subjoin the Words of the Oath.

**I** A. B. Do Swear, That I do approve the Doctrine and Discipline or Government established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to Salvation: And that I will not endeavour by my self or any other directly or indirectly, to bring in any Popish Doctrine, contrary to that which is so Establish'd: Nor will I ever give my Consent to alter the Government of this Church by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, and Arch-Deacons, &c. As it stands now establish'd, and as by Right it ought to stand, nor yet ever to Subject it to the Usurpations of the See of Rome. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and Swear according to the plain and common Sense and Understanding of the same Words: without any Equivocation, or mental Evasion, or secret Reservation whatsoever. And this I do heartily, willingly, and truly upon the Faith of a Christian. So help me God in Jesus Christ.

How then can your Grace justly Reproach Pope, *Pius* for requiring Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and Converts, to Swear and Subscribe to Articles consented unto and decreed by, not a *Provincial* or *National*, but by



by several *General Councils*, where the Representatives of the whole Church of Christ were assembled. In a word, Pope *Pius* added only twelve to the twelve Articles of the Creed, and your Grace's Church added 27 to the same twelve Articles of the Creed.

---

C H A P. V.

*Of the Authority of the Church.*

**Y**OUR Grace's tenth Paragraph Recites the Conversation you had with divers Persons of our perswasion concerning the Authority of the Church, which we say is an Infalible Guide, that cannot Err in matters of Faith, where your Grace is pleas'd to add that not one of all those you happen'd to meet with, has given you that Account of the Church, which is set down in our own Catechism, commonly call'd the *Roman Catechism*, publish'd by the Pope's Authority, in pursuance of a Decree of the Council of *Trent*.

In the 11th paragraph your Grace tells us, that some of those with whom you discours'd have argued after this manner: As we believe "in God the Father, in God the Son, and in God the Holy Ghost, so we believe in the Holy Catholick Church." And to shew that this is false Reasoning, you quote the very Words of the said Catechism, first in *Latin*, and then in *English*: *Unam igitur Ecclesiam Sanctam & Catholicam esse necessario credendum est. Tres enim Trinitatis Personas Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum, ita credimus ut in eis Fidem nostram colloce-*

## Of the Authority of the Church.

*collocemus. Nunc autem mutata dicendi Forma, Sanctam, & non in Sanctam Ecclesiam, credere profuemur; ut hac etiam diversa loquendi Ratione Deus omnium Effector à creatis Rebus distinguatur.*

This, My Lord, is very right, and we are ready to stand by it; whatever some ignorant People might have argued otherwise before your Grace: But what you infer from thence, in your 12th. and 13th Paragraphs, is what I can by no means agree to. Your Grace founding your Reasoning upon the Difference between believing in God, and believing the Catholick Church tells us, *Paragraph 13th.* that “when  
“any Doctrine plainly appears to be delivered  
“in those holy Scriptures, which both you and  
“we acknowledge to be the *Word of God*: this  
“we must all own to be the Doctrine of God;  
“nor can we entertain the least Doubt of the  
“Truth of such Doctrine, because we believe in  
“God, and in God *we are to place our Faith*,  
“as your *Catechism* expressly teaches: But when  
“the Church delivers a Doctrine, we are not to  
“Receive it as a Doctrine of Faith, until it ap-  
“pears that the Church has so received it from  
“God: For otherwise we should place our  
“Faith in the *Church*; we should believe in the  
“*Church*: Which the same *Catechism*, as plain-  
“ly as Words can make it, tells us we are by no  
“Means to do; and that if we should do so,  
“we shou’d not, as we ought to do, sufficiently  
“distinguish between God and his Creatures.”

All the Force of this Argument consists in this, that, because we *believe in God*, and not in the *Catholick Church*; we are not to Receive any Doctrine deliver’d by the *Catholick Church*,

## Of the Authority of the Church.

45

Church, until it appears that the Church herself has so Received it from God. Pray My Lord, how shall this appear? Or by what Means shall we be certain of it? Or how shall we assuredly know, that the Gospel it self is the Word of God, but upon the Authority of the Church? *Non crederem Evangelio nisi me commoverat Ecclesie Autoritas*, saith St. Austin. We believe then in God; because all our Faith (as your Grace, who are a good Divine, knows very well) is resolved into the Divine Authority. And we believe the *Catholick Church*; That is, we believe not only that there is a *Catholick Church*, but also believe that the Doctrine which she Teaches us is certainly true; because the very Gospel which we believe, upon her *Authority* to be the Word of God, bids us hear her, that is give Credit to her Doctrine, and because the same Gospel tells us, she has the Promise of Christ, that the Holy Ghost shall abide with her for ever, and guide her into all Truth, and even that Christ himself shall be with her unto the end of the World.

St. Austin's Answer to the *Manichæans* upon this Subject, *Lib. uno contra Epistolam Fundamenti Cap. 5.* is worth your Grace's Observation. "Videamus igitur (says he) quid me  
" doceat *Manichæus*, & potissimum illum con-  
" sideremus Librum, quem FUNDAMENTI  
" EPISTOLAM dicitis, ubi totum penè quod  
" creditis continetur. Ipsa enim nobis illo tem-  
" pore miseris quando lecta est illuminati dice-  
" bamur à vobis. Certè sic incipit: MANI-  
" CHÆUS *Apostolus Jesu Christi Providen-*  
" *tia Dei Patris. Hæc sunt salubria Verba de*  
" *perenni ac vivo Fonte.* Jam cum bona Pa-  
" tencia,



“tinentia, si placet, attendite quid quaram. Non  
 “credo istum esse Apostolum Christi. Qua-  
 “so ne succenseatis, & maledicere incipiat.  
 “Nostis enim me statuisse, nihil prolatum te,  
 “mere credere. Quæro ergo quis sit iste *Ma-*  
 “*nichæus*? Respondebitis, *Apostolus Christi*.  
 “Non credo: Quid jam dicas aut facias non ha-  
 “bebis; promittebas enim Scientiam Veritatis,  
 “& nunc quod nescio cogis ut credam. Evan-  
 “gelium mihi fortasse lecturus es, & inde *Ma-*  
 “*nichæi* personam tentabis afferere. Si ergo in-  
 “venires aliquem, qui Evangelio nondum cre-  
 “dit, quid faceres dicenti tibi, non credo? E-  
 “go verò Evangelio non crederem, nisi me  
 “Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret Autoritas.  
 “Quibus ergo obtemperavi dicentibus, Crede  
 “Evangelio; cur eis non obtemperem dicenti-  
 “bus mihi: Noli credere *Manichæis*? Elige  
 “quid velis. Si dixeris, Crede Catholicis;  
 “ipsi me monent ut nullam Fidem accommo-  
 “dem vobis: Quapropter non possum illis cre-  
 “dens, nisi tibi non credere. Si dixeris: Noli  
 “Catholicis credere: Non rectè facies per E-  
 “vangelium me cogere ad *Manichæi* Fidem;  
 “quia ipsi Evangelio Catholicis prædicantibus  
 “credidi. Si autem dixeris, Rectè credidisti Ca-  
 “tholicis laudantibus Evangelium, sed non rectè  
 “illis credidisti vituperantibus *Manichæum*: Us-  
 “que adeo me Stultum putas, ut nulla reddita  
 “Ratione quod vis credam, quod non vis non cre-  
 “dam? Multo enim justius atque cautius facio,  
 “si Catholicis quoniam semel credidi, ad te non  
 “transeo, nisi me non credere jusseris, sed ma-  
 “nifestissimè ac apertissimè scire aliquid feceris;  
 “Quocirca si mihi Rationem redditurus es, di-  
 “mitte Evangelium, Si ad Evangelium te te-



“ nes; ego me ad eos teneam, quibus præcipi-  
 “ entibus Evangelio credidi; & his jubentibus  
 “ tibi omninò non credam. Quòd si forte in  
 “ Evangelio aliquid apertissimum de *Manichæi*  
 “ Apostolatu invenire potueris, infirmabis mihi  
 “ Catholicorum Authoritatem, qui jubent ut  
 “ tibi non credam: Qua infirmata, jam nec E-  
 “ vangelio credere potero, quia per eos illi cre-  
 “ dideram, ita nihil apud me valebit, quidquid  
 “ inde protuleris. Quapropter si nihil mani-  
 “ festum de *Manichæi* Apostolatu in Evangelio  
 “ reperitur, Catholicis potius credam quam ti-  
 “ bi. Si autem aliquid inde manifestum pro  
 “ *Manichæo* legeris, nec illis, nec tibi: Illis,  
 “ quia de te mihi mentiti sunt; tibi autem, quia  
 “ eam Scripturam mihi profers, cui per illos cre-  
 “ dideram, qui mihi mentiti sunt. Sed absit ut  
 “ ego Evangelio non credam. Illi enim cre-  
 “ dens, non invenio quomodo possim etiam tibi  
 “ credere. Apostolorum enim Nomina, quæ ibi  
 “ leguntur, non inter se continent Nomen *Ma-  
 “ nichæi.*”

Let us see, then, what Manicheus doth  
 reach me, and let us chiefly consider that  
 Book which you call *Epistolam Fundamenti*,  
 where the whole, almost, of your Belief is  
 contained: For at the time that it was read  
 to me a Wretch, \* I was said by you to have  
 been illuminated. Thus it begins: Manicheus  
 an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the Providence  
 of God the Father: These are wholesome  
 Words from the everflowing and living Foun-  
 tain. Now, by our Leave, if you please, take  
 Notice of what I ask. I do not believe him  
 to be an Apostle of Christ. Pray be not  
 angry, nor begin to Curse. For you know I

\* This St.  
*Augustin*,  
 says of  
 himself  
 alluding  
 to the  
 Time  
 when he  
 was a Ma-  
 nichean.

am

## Of the Authority of the Church.

am determined to believe nothing rashly that is said by you. I ask then, who is this Manicheus? You will answer me, an Apostle of Christ. I do not believe it. What can you then do or say for your self? For you promised me the Knowledge of the Truth, and now you compel me to believe what I know not. Possibly you will read me the Gospel, and endeavour to assert the Person of Manicheus. But if you met a Man, who did not as yet believe the Gospel, what would you do, if he should tell you, I do not believe it? For I my self would not believe the Gospel except the Authority of the Church had moved me to it. Those therefore, whom I obey'd, when they said unto me: Believe the Gospel, why should I not obey them, when they say unto me: Do not believe the Manicheans? Chuse which you will. If you say: Believe the Catholicks. They admonish me to give no Credit unto you: Wherefore, when I believe them, I cannot believe you. If you say: Do not believe the Catholicks, you will not do well to compel me to believe by the Gospel the Faith of Manicheus, because I believed the Gospel it self upon the Credit of the Catholicks. But if you say: You did well to believe the Catholicks, when they praised the Gospel, but did not well to believe them, when they dispraised Manicheus: Do you think me to be such a Fool, as to believe, without any Reason, what you will, and not to believe what you will not? For I am much more just and cautious (since I have once believed the Catholicks) if I do not go over to you, except you Command me not to believe  
but

but make me plainly and manifestly know something. Wherefore if you will shew me Reason, lay aside the Gospel. If you hold to the Gospel, I will hold unto those who commanded me to believe it; and in obedience to their Commands, I will not at all believe you. But if perchance you find any thing in the Gospel manifestly of the Apostleship of Manicheus, you will weaken with me the Authority of the Catholicks, who command me not to believe you: Which being weakened, I cannot then believe the Gospel because I believed it upon their Authority; so nothing that you bring from thence will weigh with me. Wherefore if nothing manifest concerning the Apostleship of Manicheus is found in the Gospel, I will rather believe the Catholicks than you. But if you read any thing manifest in it for Manicheus, I will neither believe them nor you: Them, because they told me a Lie concerning you; nor you, because you produce me that Scripture, to which I gave Credit upon the Authority of those, who told me the Lie. But far be it from me not to believe the Gospel. For believing it, I do not find how I can believe you. For among the Names of the Apostles therein contained, the Name of Manicheus is not to be found."

I shall not trouble your Grace with a Recital of what is contained in the 14th. 15th. and 16th. Paragraphs. But shall only beg leave to Remark, where your Grace says, in the 16th. out of St. Austin, That the Church is God's faithful People, dispersed through the whole World; that of this Church there are two Parts, the Tri-



## Of the Authority of the Church.

*umphant and the Militant*: I beg leave to Remark, I say, that tho' what St. *Austin* says is very true, yet, in my humble Opinion, in Order to clear the Point in debate, your Grace would have done better, had you been pleas'd to say: *Of this Church there are two Parts, viz. Ecclesia docens, & Ecclesia audiens. The Church that Teacheth, and the Church that heareth; or in fewer Words, of Pastors and People, the Pastors for teaching, and the People for hearing, or to be taught: For by this Division of the Catholick Church, we may see, who are those who are to teach, and who are to hear and obey: The Pastors are to rule and teach the Flock, pursuant to the Doctrine of St. Paul Acts, 20. 28. Attendite Vobis, & universo Gregi; in quo Vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit Episcopos, regere Ecclesiam Dei, quam acquisivit Sanguine suo, Take heed unto your selves, and to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to Govern the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood; and the People or Flock are to hear and obey, pursuant to the Doctrine of the same Apostle. Hebrews, Cap. 13. 17. Obedite Præpositis vestris, & Subjacete eis, ipsi enim per vigilant, quasi Rationem pro Animabus vestris reddituri, ut cum Gaudio hoc facient, & non gementes. Obey your Rulers, and submit your selves unto them. For they watch as being to give an Account of your Souls, that they may do it with Joy, and not with Grief.*

Hence I think it is evident, that the *Ecclesia docens*, the Rulers and Pastors of the Church have an unlimited Authority to teach and govern the Flock, and that the Flock or People are obliged and bound in Conscience to obey and submit

## Of the Authority of the Church.

51

submit to their Doctrine. Your Grace may possibly ask: What if the Pastors of the Church shou'd teach false Doctrine? To this I answer by another Question: Who shall be Judge, of the Truth or Falshood of the Doctrine: The Church or the Party, who affirms the Doctrine to be false? Your Grace will possibly say: Neither of them, but the Scriptures. But, My Lord, since the true Meaning of the Sense of the Scripture is the Thing in Question: I ask your Grace whether the Sense and Meaning which the Catholick Church, who is guided by the Holy Ghost, gives it, is not more likely to be true than the Sense which any Private Man, to whom no such divine Assistance is promised, puts upon it?

You your selves My Lord, seem to give the like Authority to your own Church, bating that you add an Exception or *Proviso*, which in my humble Opinion, destroys all Authority. For thus your Church speaks in the 20th. of the 39. *20 Art.* *Articles: The Church hath Power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith; And yet it is not Lawful for the Church to Ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another.* This Exception or *Proviso*, I say, spoils all, and renders the Authority of the Church precarious. For what Man whether learned or unlearned, did ever broach a new Doctrine, who did not say, that the Doctrine of the Church was contrary to God's Word written? *Arius* was a learned Man, so was *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, and many other *Arian* Bishops and Priests, and did they not cry out, that

D 2

the

## Of the Authority of the Church.

the Word *Consubstantial*, was not to be met with in God's Word written, and not only so, but was contrary to it? Did not the *Macedonians*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Pelagians*, *Donatists*, *Monothelites*, and generally all Hereticks, who sprung up in the Church of God unto this Present Time, respectively say the same thing, and appeal to God's Word written, and profess to abide by it, provided they had the Liberty, to interpret God's Word written, and to be themselves the Judges of the Sense thereof? And is it thus our wise Law-giver Jesus Christ provided for the Peace and Unity of the Christian World, for whose Souls he shed his precious Blood? Did he leave them at Liberty to read his Will and Testament, and construe it every Man after his own Fancy; and interpret it in as many different Manners, as there are different Humours and Tempers in Men, or as they are differently affected, or prejudiced by interest, Passion, or Pride? If so, then farewell Order and Discipline; welcome Confusion and Anarchy; then, in vain do the Prophets liken the Church to a well disciplin'd Army, and terrible *as an Army drawn up in Battle Array, terribilis ut Castorum Acies ordinata*; In vain did Christ recommend Unity and Concord to his Disciples; and St. Paul to the Christians; In vain did he exhort them to a Belief of *one God, one Faith, and one Baptism*, if Christ has left his Testament to be scanned, and interpreted to as many different and contradictory Senses, as there are different Humours, Tempers, Passions and Prejudices in Capricious Men; In vain, in fine, did he declare, *that he had other Sheep, that were not of his Fold, that them he would bring*



bring in, that they would hear his Voice, and that there would be one Sheepfold and one Shepherd. But far be it from the Heart of any pious Christian to entertain any such Thoughts of the supreme Wisdom, of the wisest of Legislators. He constituted St. Peter, whom he called a Rock, his Vicar on Earth, made him the Center of Unity, and commanded him to feed his Flock, his Sheep and his Lambs. He established his Church upon this Rock, promised that the Gates of Hell shou'd not prevail against it, that the Holy Ghost, shou'd abide with it for ever, guide it into all Truth, and that whoever wou'd not hear the Church shou'd be looked upon as an *Heathen Man* and a *Publican*.

This is the testamentary Disposition of our great and wise Legislator, than which no human Means can more contribute to cement Unity in Faith, Subordination in Government, or Peace and Charity among Christians. But if Men, proud in their own Conceits, or actuated by their Passions and Prejudices, will follow the Dictates of their prejudicate Notions, what written or traditionary Law, (tho' never so plain) whether Divine or human that is not liable to be wrested to a Sense different from the Intent and meaning of the Legislator

CH A P. VI.

*Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.*

**T**HE 17th. 18th. 19th. 20th. 21st. Paragraphs, I shall likewise pass over, as containing nothing material, but what was, I think,

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

sufficiently answer'd, when I spoke to what your Grace says in the 16th Paragraph. The 22d. Paragraph contains some Questions of Moment, to which I shall beg leave to answer in the same Order, as they lyen to my Warranted.

Did the Apostles, (says your Grace) in all Places where they Preach'd, teach the Christian Church, under the Penalty of Damnation, to believe, that in the Mass there is offer'd a true proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the Dead? Or is there the least Mention or Intimation of such a Sacrifice, as this in the whole New Testament?

To the first of these Questions I answer, that I know not whether the Apostles, did in all Places where they Preach'd, teach this Doctrine; but I believe they did preach it in many Places. To the Second, that there is sufficient Mention and Intimation in the Evangelist St. Luke, and in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, Cap. vii. of what we understand by the Sacrifice of the Mass, which we affirm to be a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice, and consequently may be offer'd for the Living and the Dead. As to the Word Mass, I grant there is no such Word mention'd in the New Testament. It is a Word (in my Opinion) borrowed from the Practice, used in the primitive Times, of dismissing the *Catechumens*, before the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ was to be offer'd: For to let them understand they were not to assist at the Sacrifice, they were sent away with an *Ite Missa est*, which in the Language of those Times signified: *Withdraw, you are dismissed*. But so long as we have a sufficient Warrant for the thing signified by the Word Mass, namely, that it is a true, proper

*proper and propitiatory Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ*, we have no Reason to reject a Word which the Use and Practice of so many Ages has, in a Manner, consecrated. To make out then, that the *Mass* is a *true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice*, I shall in the first place set down the Words of *Christ*, when he instituted it, and the Words of *St. Paul* declaring the Institution. In the second Place, produce the Testimony of the ancient oriental *Liturgies*, and lastly the Sentiments of the holy Fathers of the primitive Church concerning this *Sacrifice*. But before I begin, I cannot but lament the hardness of our Fate, to be put upon proving, that the Oblation of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, in the *Mass*, is a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, when the Sacrifices in the old Law, of *Bulls, Heifers, Rams, Lambs*, nay of *Oil and fine Flower*, are frequently so called in Terms at least equivalent to it. For what is a *propitiatory Sacrifice*, but a Sacrifice capable to atone for Sins, or fit to move Almighty God to be *propitious* or merciful to Sinners? And were not all the *Sin Offerings*, so often repeated in the Books of *Moses*, of this Nature? *Sicut pro Peccato offertur Hostia, ita & pro Delicto: Utriusque Hostia Lex una erit: ad Sacerdotem qui eam obtulerit, pertinebit.* Englished thus in your Bible: *As the Sin Offering is, so is the Trespass Offering: There is one Law for them: The Priest that maketh Attonement therewith, shall have it.* *Levit. Cap. 7. 7.* Surely then, the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*, if offer'd to the Heavenly Father, is much more capable to atone for Sins, and to move him to be merciful or *propitious* to Sinners, than the *Flesh and Blood of Bulls,*



## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS:

*Bulls, Heifers, Rams or Lambs, and consequently may be called a propitiatory Sacrifice, or Sin Offering, the one being the same as the other. It remaineth then only to prove, that Christ did offer his Body and Blood, as a Sacrifice to his Heavenly Father, after the Legal Supper, and before he Suffer'd on the Cross. To begin with St. Luke. This Evangelist tells us, Cap. 22. V.V. 19, 20. that after the legal Supper, Christ took Bread, gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it unto the Apostles saying: HOC EST CORPUS MEUM, quod pro vobis datur: Hoc facite in Meam Commemorationem: Similiter Et Calicem postquam Canavit dicens: Hic est Calix novum Testamentum, in meo Sanguine, qui pro vobis fundetur: THIS IS MY BODY, which is given for you: Do this in Remembrance of me: Likewise also the Challice, after he had Supped, saying: This Challice is the Testament in my Blood, which shall be shed for you. Your Version has; Which is shed for you: But this is no material Difference, it being usual with the Jews to put the future Tense, for the present, and the present Tense, for the future, St. Paul 1. Cor. Cap. 11. gives the same Account of this Mylterious Institution, and declares he had received it of the Lord: From both of them, we may observe, that Christ did not say: This is my Body which is given to you: But: This is my Body which is given for you. And the same of the Challice or Cup. He gave it indeed to them, and gave it for them. That he gave it to them, is plain from these Words: Accipite Et Manducate: Take and Eat, and even changed the Bread into his Body, and the Wine into his Blood, as I shall endeavour*

your

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

57

vour to make out hereafter. That he gave it for them is no less plain, from these other Words. *Quod pro vobis datur, which is given for you.* So that he did at once make a Sacrament, and offer a Sacrifice for the Remission of Sins, as St. *Matthew* observes: A Sacrament by vailing his Body and Blood under the Species of Bread and Wine; and a Sacrifice by separating Mystically his Body from his Blood, and offering them up to his heavenly Father.

Now the Nature of the *Sacrament* consists in this, that the Body and Blood of our Lord under the Species of Bread and Wine are given unto us, as the Spiritual Food and Refection of our Souls. And the Nature of the *Sacrifice* in this: That the Body and Blood of our Lord, under the same Species, are by Virtue of the Words of Christ, as by the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, separated, or set a part: The Body alone, by Virtue of the Words, under the Species of Bread, and the Blood alone, under the Species of Wine; that by this Means the Passion and Death of our Lord might be represented and celebrated; and Christ himself Mystically Sacrificed for us, and offer'd to God the Father *for the Remission of Sins.* I might produce some other Texts of Scripture in proof of this Matter; but that I am perswaded your Grace will put no Stress upon any Reflection I can make upon them; nor value any Theological Reason, I might offer to support my Opinion. I shall therefore proceed to what I believe your Grace has a great Veneration for, namely, the ancient *Oriental Liturgies* of the primitive Church, which stand in need of no Gloss or Comment, and make as  
much

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

much for us as is possible for Words to express; being what I promis'd to produce in the second Place.

These *Liturgies* were made English about seven Years since by Dr. Brett a Minister of the Church of England, an unexceptionable Witness: Since it is not to be presumed, he would say any thing in Favour of the Roman Catholics, (whom he otherwise opposes with all his Might) but what the Evidence of Truth extorted from him. They are call'd as follow.

The *Liturgy* of St. James the Apostle, which was anciently used in the Church of Jerusalem, translated from the Original Greek and publish'd in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. Tom. 2. Paris. 1624.

The *Liturgy* of St. Mark the Evangelist, which was the ancient *Liturgy* of the Church of Alexandria, and was used throughout Egypt, Lybia, Pentapolis, and Ethiopia; translated from the Edition of Monsieur L'abbé Renaudot, published in Greek and Latin at Paris, 1716.

The *Liturgy* of St. John Chrysostom, which is the *Liturgy* used in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and published by F. Goar in his *Euchologium*, or Collection of the Offices of the Greek Church. Printed at Paris, 1647.

The *Liturgy* of St. Basil, which is used upon some of the great Festivals throughout the Patriarchate of Constantinople, publish'd by the same F. Goar, in the said *Euchologium*.

The *Liturgy* of the Church of Ethiopia, a vast Country beyond Egypt, subject to the Patriarch of Alexandria in *Spiritualibus*, so far as always to apply to him for the Consecration of their

Me-



## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

59

*Metropolitan, Sede vacante* ; translated from the *Ethiopick* Language into *Latin* by *Renaudot*, and published at *Paris*, 1716.

The *Liturgy* of *Nestorius*, used by the *Nestorian* Hereticks, a Sect, who revolted from the Church some time before the Middle of the fifth Century, and continue to this Day in several Parts of the *East* ; Translated from the *Syriack* Language into *Latin* by *Renaudot*, and published at *Paris* 1716.

The *Liturgy* of *Severus* Patriarch of *Antioch*, about the latter End of the fifth Century. translated by *Renaudot* from the *Syriack* Language, printed at *Paris*, 1716.

These, *Liturgies* are the standing Rule, the unexceptionable Evidence of the Belief and Practice of the Apostles, and of the Apostolical Pastors of the greatest Christian Antiquity, with Respect to the Oblation, and Consecration of the Bread and Wine in the Mysteries. For altho' it may be granted, that neither the *Liturgy* of St. *James*, nor that of St. *Mark*, were in writing as they now stand, before the Beginning of the 4th. Century, or before the Emperor *Constantine* the Great gave Peace to the Church, nor possibly in some Years after: But that the Pastors of the Church used a traditionary Form which they held, and rehearsed in the Assemblies where the Christians were Convened to Celebrate the Mysteries; and in which the Bishops or Priests always presided: Yet it is admirable, and in a manner, miraculous, to behold, what Harmony and Agreement there is, not only between the two first, but also between all the rest, and with the two first, in all things that Relate to the Essence or Substance of the

## 60 . Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

Sacrifice and Sacrament; tho' they were used in different Languages, and by People of different and distant Kingdoms who never saw or knew one another. In all these *Liturgies*, when they come to what we call the *Canon* of the *Mass*, they have the *Sursum Corda*. Then, the *Seraphick Hymn* or *Trisagion*, the Prayer of Thanksgiving to God for his Benefits; the Prayer for the Christians in general, the Commemoration of the Saints and Martyrs, the Prayer for the Repose of the Souls of all the Faithful who died in the Bosome of the Church; the Oblation of the Gifts on the Altar, or the *Anaphora*, the Words of Consecration, and the Prayer to the Holy Ghost to come and descend upon the Gifts: Nor is it any Exception to the Validity of the Evidence of the *Liturgies* of St. *James* and St. *Mark*, that there is mention made in them of the *Consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father; of the Virgin *Mary's* being the Mother of God, Terms, not in use before the Council of *Nice* or *Ephesus*. For these Words were undoubtedly added to, or inserted in those *Liturgies*, in order to inculcate in the Minds of the People, what the Fathers had decreed against *Arius* and *Nestorius*, in the aforesaid Councils.

Let us hear, then My Lord, what Account these *Liturgies* give of the Gifts, that is, of the Bread and Wine, which are laid upon the Altar, and by what Name they call them.

In the *Liturgy* of St. *James*, when the Priest has pronounced the Words of Consecration, he putteth up a Prayer to Almighty God; in which we find these Words: *We Sinners offer to thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice,*

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

61

*Sacrifice, beseeching thee not to deal with us after our Sins, nor reward us according to our Iniquities: And again in another Place, the Priest lifting up the Gift or Victim, putteth up this Prayer: O Lord our God, the Incomprehensible Word of God, of one eternal, and inseparable Substance, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, accept the immortal and seraphick Hymn, at thy holy and unbloody Sacrifices, from me a Sinner, crying and saying, &c.*

*In the Liturgy of St. Mark, we read this Prayer: Thou createdst all things by thy Wisdom, the true Light, thine only begotten Son, our Lord, our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Wherefore giving Thanks through him to thee together with him and the Holy Ghost, we offer the reasonable and unbloody Worship, Latteia, which is offered to thee by all Nations, from the rising to the setting of the Sun, &c. Again in another Prayer: Sanctifie also, O God, this Sacrifice with thy Heavenly Benediction, by the Descent of thine Holy Spirit upon it, &c.*

*In the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, we read, that the Priest bowing down, lays with a low Voice: We offer to thee this reasonable and unbloody Worship Latreia, and beg, pray and beseech thee to send down thine holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts lying before thee.*

*In the Liturgy of St. Basil, which is used upon some of the great Festivals throughout the Patriarchate of Constantinople. We find this Rubrick.*

*But if it be the great Sabbath, they Sing:*

*Let all Flesh be silent and stand with Fear and trembling, laying aside all earthly Thoughts: For the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, comes forth*



## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

forth to be Sacrificed, and given for Food to the Faithful; preceded by Choirs of Arch-Angels, Principalities, and Powers, the many Eyed Cherubim, and six winged Seraphim, who covering their Eyes, sing aloud Allelujah.

In the *Ethiopian Liturgy*, we read that when the Priest has pronounced the Words of Consecration over the Bread, the People say: *Amen, Amen, Amen. We believe, and are certain; we praise, O Lord our God, this is truly thy Body, and so we believe.* And after the Words of Consecration over the Cup, the People say: *Amen, this is truly thy Blood, and we believe it.* And a little after the Priest saith: *And now, O Lord, celebrating the Memorial of thy Death and Resurrection, we offer to thee this Bread and this Cup; giving Thanks to thee, that by them thou hast made us worthy to stand before thee, and perform the Priestly Office unto thee.*

In the *Liturgy of Nestorius*, the Priest says these Words: *We offer to thee the Lord and God of all, for all our fellow Creatures, a lively and reasonable Oblation of our first Fruits, the unbloody and acceptable Sacrifice of the Son of Man, which the Prophets taught in Myseries, the Apostles plainly, and the Martyrs became Partakers of, by their Blood.* And again, in another Prayer addressed likewise to God the Father, the Priest saith: *We offer to thee this lively, holy, acceptable, excellent, and unbloody Sacrifice for all thy Creatures; and for thy holy Catholick and Apostolick Church, which is spread over the Face of the whole Earth.*

Here is a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for all God's Creatures which surely comprehends

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

63

prehends at least all the Faithful both Living and Dead; and (which is more worthy of our Notice) it is borrowed from the *Liturgy* of a Sect of Hereticks; who have had no Communion in sacred Rites, with either the *Greek* or *Latin Churches* these 1250 Years; so that it is equal to a Demonstration, the Belief of a *true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead*, was the Doctrine of all the Eastern Churches before the Revolt of *Nestorius* and his Sectators.

In the *Liturgy* of *Severus* after the Priest pronounces the Words of Consecration over the Bread and the Wine, he puts up this Prayer to Jesus Christ. *We therefore, O Lord Jesu, offer this unbloody Sacrifice, and implore thy Pity towards Mankind, which Induced thee to give thy self a Sacrifice for us.*

Here is another substantial Evidence of the *Mass's* being a *true, proper and Propitiatory Sacrifice*. For the Heretick *Severus* and his Sectators, who had revolted from the Catholick Church about the Middle of the fifth Century; would not call the *Mass* an *unbloody Sacrifice*, nor have any such Expressions in his *Liturgy*, had not that Doctrine been the Belief of the Churches of *Asia* before his Revolt. Besides it is to be observed, that neither *Nestorius*, nor *Severus* were condemned or branded as Hereticks for any of these *Tenets*; but for Points especially Marked in the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Calcedon*: *Nestorius*, for denying the Virgin *Mary* to be the Mother of God, &c. And *Severus* for adhering to the Heresie of *Eutyches*, who denied that Christ had two Natures, &c.

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

I shall not here speak of the *Roman Liturgy* with which your Grace is very well acquainted; and which doth not speak of the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass* with near so Magnificent Terms as the *Greek* and *Oriental Liturgies* do. I only beg leave to remark, that it is as ancient as the Times of *St. Ambrose*, and *Pope Gelasius*, Doctor *Brett* himself being my Witness, that the *Ambrosian* and *Gelasian Liturgies*, at least what *Pamelius* and *Thomasius* have published under those Names, did not differ in that Part, which he proposed to publish, from the present *Roman Missal* or *Mass-Book*. Thus much concerning the *Liturgies* which I borrowed from Dr. *Brett's* Translation of them. I now proceed, in the last Place to give the Sentiments of the ancient Fathers of the Church concerning this *Sacrifice*.

And here I shall not give your Grace the Trouble of reading all the Passages of the Fathers, which may be brought in Proof of this *Tenet*. Three or four ancient Fathers eminent for their Piety, for the Sanctity of their Lives, for their great and universal Learning and Knowledge in things Sacred and Profane, and thoroughly read in the Discipline and practice of the Ages preceding them, and in those of their own, are equal to a Thousand Witnesses, that what they taught and practiced, was the Doctrine not only of the whole Catholic Church in their own Days, but also of the Ages that preceded them.

To begin with *St. Cyrian*: This great Bishop and Martyr, who flourished in the Year 240. in his Epistle \* to his own Priests, Deacons, and Laity, hath these Words: "*Laurentinus*

" &



“ & Ignatius, in Castris & ipsi quondam sæcu-  
 “ laribus Milicantes, sed veri & Spirituales Dei  
 “ Milites: Dum Diabolum Christi Confessione  
 “ prosterunt, Palmas à Domino & Coronas il-  
 “ lustri Passione Meruerunt. Sacrificia pro eis  
 “ semper, ut Meminitis, offerimus quoties Mar-  
 “ tyrum Passiones & Dies anniversaria Comme-  
 “ moratione Celebamus.” *Laurentinus and Ignatius, were in Times past Soldiers in a secular Warfare, but since, true and Spiritual Soldiers of God: When they cast down the Devil, by Confessing Christ they merited Palms and Crowns by their Passion, we offer Sacrifices for them, as you Remember, as often as we celebrate the Passions and anniversary Commemoration of the Martyrs. And again Epist. ad Cæcilium.* “ Nam quis magis  
 “ Sacerdos Dei summi quam Dominus noster  
 “ Jesus Christus? qui Sacrificium Deo Patri ob-  
 “ tulit, & obtulit hoc idem quod *Melchisedec*  
 “ obtulerat, id est Panem & Vinum, suum scilicet  
 “ Corpus & Sanguinem,” *For what Priest of the most high God is greater than our Lord Jesus Christ? who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and even the same which Melchisedec offer'd, namely Bread and Wine, that is, his own Body and Blood.*

St. Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem, who flourish'd a little after the first Council of Nice, about the Year, 340. This great and learned Father, I say, wrote a Book for the Instruction of his own Flock, which he calls a *Mystagogical Catechism*, and divided it into several Parts, for the Benefit of the Youth of his Diocese. In the fifth Part, or Catechism, hath these Words; as they are made English by Doctor Brett †: Then we also make mention of those, who are at Rest before us: First the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles,

† Collection of principal Liturgies.

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

Martyrs, that God, thro' their Prayers and Supplications, wou'd receive our Prayers : Then we pray for the Deceased Fathers and Bishops : Lastly for all those that once lived with us, and are now departed ; believing it to be a great Benefit unto their Souls for whom Prayer is made, whilst the Holy and tremendous Sacrifice lies before us : which I will shew you by an Example. For I know that many say : What signifies it to a Soul to be mentioned in our Prayers, whether it went out of the World with Sins or without ? For if any King shou'd send into Banishment those which have offended him, but afterwards some of their Friends making a Crown, shou'd offer it to him in behalf of those that are thus punished ; wou'd he not be disposed to remit their Punishment ? In like Manner, we offering Prayers for the Dead, although they were Sinners, do not make a Crown, but offer Christ, who was slain for our Sins, that we may render him, who is the Lover of Men, gracious and propitious both to them and to us.

There was then in the Catholick Church, in the Days of St. Cyril, an Holy and tremendous Sacrifice offer'd for the Living and the Dead, a Sacrifice capable of rendering Jesus Christ gracious and propitious both to one and the other.

Give me leave then, My Lord, to ask whether your Grace does not believe, St. Cyril was a Holy orthodox Father of the Church ? Whether such a Man, in whose Days Thousands of Christians both from the East and the West, repair'd to Jerusalem to visit the holy Sepulchre, and the Cross of Christ set up in that holy City some Years before, was not well acquainted with the Faith and Practice of all the Faithful  
of

of those Times? And whether he would have left upon Record so plain a Tellimony of a *propitiuous*, or *propitiatory Sacrifice*, being offer'd for the Living and the Dead, if it had not been the Doctrine and Practice of the whole Catholick Church, when he governed that holy See? And if it was orthodox Doctrine and, practiced then, why not so in our Days? If this Holy and learned Bishop had said half so much against the Sacrifice of the Mass, or against offering it *for the Living and the Dead*; and that tho' never so obscurely, I am confident his Authority wou'd often be urged against us: But he goes with the Torrent of the Holy Fathers, whose Faith and Practice, the same with ours, they have left Recorded in as plain, easie and familiar Terms, as Words can possibly express.

St. Jerom. Lib. adversus *Vigilantium*, Cap. 3.

"Male ergo facit *Romanus Episcopus*; qui  
"super Mortuorum Hominum *Petri & Pauli*  
"Ossa veneranda, secundum te pulvisculum, offert  
"Domino Sacrificia, & Tumulos eorum arbitrat  
"tur Altaria, idque non solum unius Urbis, sed  
"totius Orbis faciunt Episcopi." *It is ill done*  
*then of the Bishop of Rome, who over the venerable*  
*Bones (contemptible Dust according to you)*  
*of Dead Men Peter and Paul offers Sacrifices*  
*unto the Lord, and supposes their Tombs to be*  
*Altars; and this is not only done by the Bishop*  
*of one City, but also by the Bishops of all the World.*

St. Ambrose in Cap. 1. *Sti. Lucae*, "Quando  
"Sacrificamus, Christus adest, Christus immo-  
"latur; etenim Pascha nostrum immolatus est  
"Christus. *When we offer Sacrifice, Christ is*  
*present, Christ is Sacrific'd. For our Pascheover*  
*is Christ Sacrific'd.*



## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

St. *Austin*, (I may say without *Hyperbole*) in an hundred places of his Works holds the same Language I shall instance only in two. The first taken out of *Concione 1. in Psal. 33.* Where he says: "Erat autem, ut Nōtis Sacrificium  
 " Judæorum antea secundum Ordinem *Aaron*  
 " in victimis Pecorum; & hoc in Myſterio.  
 " Nondum erat Sacrificium Corporis & Sanguinis Domini, quod norunt fideles, & qui Evangelium legerunt, quod Sacrificium nunc diffusum est toto Orbe Terrarum.

*There was, as ye know, first the Sacrifice of the Jews, which consisted in Victims of Cattle, and that in a Mystery. The Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord, which the Faithful know, and those who read the Gospel, was not then instituted, which Sacrifice is now spread over all the World.* The second out of *Lib. 22. de Civit. Dei Cap. 8.* "Vir Tribunitius *Hesperius*,  
 " qui apud nos est, habet in Territorio *Fussalensi* Fundum *Zubedi* appellatum, ubi cum  
 " Afflictione Animalium & Servorum suorum,  
 " Domum suam Spirituum Malignorum Vim  
 " noxiam perpeti comperisset, rogavit nostros,  
 " me absente Presbyteros, ut aliquis eorum illò  
 " pergeret, cujus Orationibus cederent: Perrexerit unus, obtulit ibi Sacrificium Corporis  
 " Christi, orans quantum potuit, ut cessaret illa  
 " Vexatio: Deo protinus miserante cessavit."

*A certain Man called Hesperius of the Tribunal Order, who liveth this Day by us, hath a little Farm, called Zubedi in the Territories of Fussali, which he having observed, by the Harm done his Servants and Cattle, to be haunted with evil Spirits, prayed my Priests, in my absence, that one of them shou'd go thither, and expel them*  
 by

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS. 69

by Prayer : One went, offer'd there the Sacrifice of Christ's Body, praying with all his Might, that this Vexation shou'd cease, and by the Mercy of God it ceased.

These Passages, I hope, My Lord, will satisfy your Grace, the primitive Fathers, and consequently the whole Catholick Church, did believe and profess, that what we now understand by the Mass, is a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice, for the Living and the Dead. If not, My Lord, be pleas'd to read *Justinus Martyr. Dialogo. cum Triphone. St. Irenæus Lib. 4. Cap. 32. Eusebius, Lib. 1. Demonstrat. Evang. Cap. 10. St. Basilus. Lib. 2. de Baptismo. St. Gregorius Nissenus, orat. 1. in Resurrectionem Christi: St. Gregorius Nazianzenus Orat. 3. & 4. adversus Julianum. St. John Chrysostom, in Psal. 95. St. Cyrillus Alexandrinus in Epistola ad Nestorium. And Theodores, in Cap. 1. Malachia. Whom your Grace shall find speaking and holding the same Language, as those Fathers, whose Passages are here set down.*

Your Grace desires us to read the latter Part of the ninth Chapter of St. Paul to the Hebrews, and that there we will find, that there is no such thing as an unbloody propitiatory Sacrifice : For without shedding of Blood is no Remission. v. 22.

I grant My Lord, there is no such thing mention'd in this Chapter of St. Paul. And the Reason why there is not, is, because St. Paul was altogether taken up with the Thoughts of inculcating to the Jews the Passion and Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and therefore speaks nothing in this Chapter of the Sacrifice which he instituted and offer'd, previous to his

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

Passion, that the same might, to the End of the World be the Memorial of his *Sacrifice* on the Cross, and an efficacious Means of applying to the Living and the Dead, the Merits thereof; and be offer'd *from the rising to the setting of the Sun*, as the Prophet *Malachy* foretold. But so long as there is mention made by *St. Paul*, and the *Evangelist St. Luke* in other Places of the Scripture of this *Sacrifice*, as I have shewn before: I think it is enough.

But your Grace, argues out of *St. Paul* in the aforesaid Chapter, *without shedding of Blood is no Remission*. Without shedding of Blood, in a bloody or unbloody manner, I grant there is no Remission: Without shedding of Blood in a bloody manner, there is no Remission, I must beg leave to deny; and think it is plain, from the Words of the Institution of this *Sacrifice*, previous to that of the Cross, where *Jesus Christ*, says: *This is my Body which is given for you. This is my Blood which is shed for you: For the Remission of Sins*; That his Blood was then shed only unbloodily and Mystically, and not bloodily, as on the Cross, and yet it was for the Remission of Sins: And by consequence there is Remission of Sins, by the *Mystically and unbloody Effusion* of the Blood of Christ, such as is made in the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*.

But for your Grace's further Satisfaction in this Matter, if you will please to read what two eminent Divines of your own Communion wrote upon this Subject. I mean *Bishop Hicks* in his *Christian Priesthood asserted*, and the Reverend *Mr. Jones* in his *Christian Sacrifice*. I flatter my self, your Grace will be of Opinion, that what *St. Paul* says in the latter Part of the 9th. Chapter to the *Hebrews* does not clash with,

not



## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

71

nor in the least weaken, the Belief of what we hold ; viz. That the *Mass* is a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice. To repeat here all these two learned Men say on the Subject, would swell this Letter to too great a Bulk : I shall therefore cite only one Passage of the latter ; where speaking of the Objections of his Adversaries, he thus confutes them : " They tell you (says he) it " is the present Tense for the future ; and if you " ask upon what Grounds this is said, they have " nothing to reply but this, viz. That Christ's " Body was not in any Sense given or offer'd to " God, till it was crucified, which is to take that " for granted, which my reader sees was denied " by the ancient Fathers : Nor does the Scrip- " ture give any Countenance to our Adversa- " ries, while they would persuade us that Christ's " Oblation was performed on the Cross only. The " four Histories of the Institution plainly declare, " that Christ's Body was given or *Sacrificed* in the " *Eucharist* ; nor is there one Word in all the new " Testament that can be urged in Contradiction " to it. Christ is often said to have given himself " for us, but that by this Phrase is meant nothing " but his dying for us upon the Cross, we are " no where told ; and since he himself has in- " formed us, that in the *Eucharist* his Body was " given, his Blood shed for us, we have just Rea- " son to believe him. He is sometimes said to " have *born our Sins*, and that this was done up- " on the Cross ; that the *Mactation* was there " performed, is not disputed. It is said, that " *Christ was once offer'd to bear the Sins of ma- " ny* Heb. 9. 28. And that the Oblation was " but one, is a most certain Apostolical Truth ; " and yet they, who limit this one Oblation " to the six Hours time, during which he hung " upon

## Of the Sacrifice of the MASS.

“ upon the Cross, are destitute of any Proof  
 “ from Scripture. That the *Sacrifice* was not  
 “ finished till our Saviour expired on the Cross,  
 “ nay till he entred into the Holy of Holies,  
 “ even Heaven itself, is evident enough; nor is  
 “ it less evident, that he began this *Sacrificial*  
 “ *Solemnity* by offering his own Body and Blood  
 “ when he instituted the *Eucharist*: Christ in-  
 “ deed bore the Punishment of *our Sins in his own*  
 “ *natural Body on the Tree.* 1. Pet. 2. 24. But  
 “ when St. Paul, as above cited, says, *He was*  
 “ *offer'd to bear the Sins of many*, it is manifest,  
 “ that there was an Oblation previous to the  
 “ sufferings or bearing there mentioned; as  
 “ when the Apostle says in the 26th. Verse of  
 “ that Chapter, *that Christ appeared once to put*  
 “ *away Sin*, his *appearing* was before his putting  
 “ away Sin. So when he says here, that he was  
 “ *once offer'd to bear*, he must in some Sense of-  
 “ fer himself before he could be capable of bear-  
 “ ing, and 'tis evident that his Crucifixion was  
 “ a Consequence of his Offering himself; and  
 “ this is the full of what St. Paul says, *Heb. 9.*  
 “ *25, 26. viz. That Christ was not often to*  
 “ *offer himself, for then he must often have suf-*  
 “ *fer'd*; he offer'd himself but once, and therefore  
 “ suffer'd but once. He began his Oblation in  
 “ the *Eucharist*, and continued it on the Cross.”

Thus, you see, My Lord, how this learned  
 Gentleman of your own Communion reconciles  
 the latter Part of the 9th. Chapter of St. Paul  
 to the *Hebrews*, with the Belief of the *Sacri-*  
*sifice* offer'd by Christ to his Father, at the last  
*Supper*; and in one Paragraph answers effectually  
 all the Questions your Grace asks us. As  
 to what he says after, in the same Place of the  
*Papists,*

*Papists*, (as he is pleas'd to call us) I am not now concerned to take Notice of it : Tho' I may possibly another Time : But will return to your Grace's 23<sup>d</sup>. Paragraph.

C H A P. VII.

*Of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation.*

**I**T begins thus: "In the next Place, did the Apostles every where teach the Christian Church, under Pain of Damnation to believe that *in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is, truly, really and substantially, the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ? And that there is a Conversion (or Change) made of the whole Substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Blood? Which Conversion (or Change) the Catholick Church (as it is pretended) calls Transubstantiation.*" Then your Grace Reasons upon the Nature of the Change of one Substance into another; with Instances, on the Change of *Water into Wine*, of an *Egg into a Bird*, tells us, *St. Paul* calls the Sacrament, Bread. And asks, if those Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, may not be as fairly accounted for, as when he says : *I am the Vine*, &c. With many other Questions and Reasonings all tending to the same Purpose; which have been answer'd over and over an hundred Times, and which, it is hard, your Grace would take no Notice of?

But



## Of the Real Presence

But if it be true, My Lord, that the Sacrament really contains the Body and Blood of Christ, and not *Figuratively*, or *Typically* only: Is it not a plain and natural Consequence, that his Body and Blood are there truly and substantially together with his Soul and Divinity? For to be really there, is surely to be truly and substantially there; and that his Body and Blood shou'd be really there without his Soul and Divinity, that are never more to be separated, *Christus jam non moritur, Mors illi ultra non dominabitur*; wou'd in effect be monstrously absurd. Again, My Lord, if his Body and Blood are really in the Sacrament, Is it not a Consequence founded in Evidence, that either they are there, together with the Substance of the Bread and the Wine, or without it? If together with the Substance of the Bread and Wine; then follows the Doctrine of *Martin Luther, Consubstantiation*; But if the Body and Blood of Christ, be in the Sacrament without the Substance of the Bread and Wine, then follows the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; So that all those other Words, *truly, Substantially, Soul and Divinity, whole Substance of the Bread, &c.* Are only stronger Expressions of the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, and of *Transubstantiation*; and were inserted in the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*, obviate the Evasions of such as wou'd maintain, that the Body and Blood of Christ, were in the Sacrament only *typically, figuratively, sacramentally*.

All the Difficulty then lies in proving the Real Presence and *Transubstantiation*, to have been the Doctrine of the Catholick Church in all Ages. For might not an *Arian* ask just such

ano-

another Question of his Orthodox Contemporaries as your Grace in this Paragraph asks of us? viz. Did the Apostles every where teach the Christian Church, under Pain of Damnation, to believe, that the Son was Consubstantial with the Father; that there were three Persons in the Trinity, really distinct from one another, and yet but one God; that there was but one divine Nature in the three Persons, and that each of these, were from all Eternity, equal in Power, equal in all Perfections without Beginning or End? What better Answer cou'd any Orthodox Believer have then made to such Arian, than to tell him, that it was the Doctrine of the Catholick Church in all the preceding Ages; that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, that God was one; that the Apostles, and the Apostolical Bishops in an uninterrupted Succession taught them to baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; to believe in God the Father, to believe in Jesus Christ, to believe in the Holy Ghost. That it naturally flows from this Doctrine, and is a plain Consequence of the same, that the Son is Cons substantial with the Father, that the Father Son and Holy Ghost are three Persons really distinct from one another, that each being God, the Attributes of Eternal, Immenſe, Omnipotent, were alike to be given to all three; that in fine, the Catholick Church taught him to believe all these plain Consequences of the blessed Trinity; and decreed them among the principal or Chief Articles of the Christian Faith.

In like Manner, My Lord, I may answer your Grace's Question, and Reason, as the Orthodox Believer did, or might have done: But

in

## Of the Real Presence

in Order to give your Grace still farther Satisfaction, I will in the first Place, endeavour to prove the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, in Consequence of it; From the Words of Christ recorded by the Evangelist, and by St. Paul. In the second Place, from the ancient Liturgies of the Primitive Church, and lastly from the primitive Fathers.

To begin then with the Words of the Promise, which Christ made to the Jews, of giving them his Flesh to eat, as Recorded in the sixth Chapter of St. John, v. v. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. *I am that Bread of Life. Your Fathers did eat Manna in the Wilderness, and are Dead. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever: And the Bread that I will give is my Flesh; which I will give for the Life of the World. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat? By this last Verse (My Lord) your Grace may see that these Words of Christ: This is my Body, this is my Blood: Are not so fairly to be accounted for in a figurative Sense, as when he said: I am the Vine, ye are the Branches John, 15. 5. I am the Door, John, 10. 7. I am the good Shepherd, v. 11. For when he said: I am the Vine, &c. The Jews were no way surpris'd at his Words, his Meaning was obvious, and the Metaphors easy: But when he said: The Bread that I will give is my Flesh, They were astonish'd, they took Offence, They strove among themselves. They ask'd one another: How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?*

They



They undoubtedly understood that he meant his real Flesh, else there wou'd have been no Room for Debate. They were shock'd at the seeming Cruelty and Difficulty of the thing, and this Occasion'd that Strife among them, that we read of, when he said, that the Bread he wou'd give was *his Flesh*. Whereas there is not the least Doubt made when he says: *I am the Vine. I am the Door*. The Relation between these Signs or Figures, and the things figur'd, or signified is easy and familiar, and the Meaning obvious; so that no Difficulty cou'd arise thereupon: But when he said: *The Bread that I will give is my Flesh*. There was no Room for understanding or accounting for his Words in a figurative Sense; for besides that he spoke of his last Testament (an A&T wherein all Men of sound Reason speak as distinctly and clearly as they possibly can) the Figure wou'd have been violent, unnatural, and strain'd, and such as our Saviour had never made Use of before: For what Relation, or even improper Similitude is there between a *Bit of Bread*, and the entire Body of a Man?

The *Jews* therefore took it, as to the reality of the Thing, in the very Sense in which our Saviour meant it: For had they mistaken his Meaning in so important a Point, or turn'd his Words to another Sense; sure he wou'd, in Vindication of his own Veracity; and for their Instruction, for whose Redemption he came to suffer Death, have immediately set them right, especially when the Matter he spoke of, was no less than his last Testament and Covenant with them, which was to hold good to the End of the World. Did not he know their Doubts? Did not he know they were shock'd at the Extraordinariness

## Of the Real Presence.

rieness of the Thing? Did not he hear them *pro*, and *con* it among themselves, some for, and some against it? *Litigabant ergo Judæi.* In a Word, did not he hear them express their Dislike of his Doctrine, not only in a loud and contentious Manner, but in a Manner injurious to his own Power and Veracity, saying: *How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?*

Why therefore did not he tell them, they mistook his Meaning; that his Words were to be understood figuratively, and to be accounted for in the same Manner, as when he before told them, he was *the Vine, the Door, &c.*? Cou'd any thing have been more reasonable, more just or easy than to have done so? But on the Contrary, does not he insist upon it in the very Sense wherein they took it? And instead of explaining his Words, which neither the Myste-rious Nature of the thing, nor the Weakness of human Understanding cou'd bear; does not he with some Warmth, nay with an Oath and Com- mination require the *eating of his Flesh*, and the *drinking of his Blood*, under no less a Penalty than Loss of eternal Life. *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you?* How then can we Ac- count for our Saviour's Words otherwise than by saying and believing, that the Bread he gave is truly and really his *Flesh*?

And to speak ingeniously, My Lord, was it not happily providential that the *Jews* should at the very first promise of this divine Institution oppose it to our Saviour's own Face, and say as much against it, as *Berengarius* or any other of his Followers in the latter Ages have said: *How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?*

Are

Are not all the Modern Objections and Difficulties of our Adversaries couch'd in this one Question of the *Jews*: *How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?* Have they any Force but what centers in the seeming Difficulty of the thing? It is beyond our Comprehension, how therefore can it be? Is not this the constant Language of our Adversaries? And suppose our Saviour were now on Earth, what more cou'd be objected to him than what the *Jews* did, or how cou'd he answer in stronger and plainer Terms than he did to the same *Jews*? The thing is Mysterious, our Understandings are limited, we cannot comprehend all the Works of his Almighty Power: Explication then as to the *How* wou'd be vain: He therefore speaks as an omnipotent Master to a weak Disciple: the thing is beyond your Reach, my Word is sufficient, my Meaning is plain, and *Verily, Verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.*

Here are all your Grace's Difficulties, and Reasonings answer'd, and silenced in one Sentence, by him who is able to work what exceeds the reach of our Understanding; and whose infallible Word is a better Security to us, than all the Demonstrations of Sense, or Reason.

Was it not then Providential that the *Jews* shou'd have murmur'd, and made Difficulties, at the first Mention of the Institution of this divine Mystery? Truths that have been received without Contradiction, and handed down to us without Doubt or Difficulty may be, indeed, questionable and suppos'd to have been too easily admitted by the Supineness and Credulity of our Ancestors



celtors; but this Doctrine cannot be liable to any such Suspicion. It was oppos'd, and contradicted to our Saviour's own Face, and he whose Power was affronted, and Veracity question'd, and who was graciously pleas'd to come down from Heaven for our Redemption and Instruction, and to leave us a perpetual Testament in his Blood; and of whom it wou'd be horrid Blasphemy to say, that he came to puzzle or lead us into Error; He I say, alone who cou'd, and ought to have explain'd his own Words, had we been capable of understanding them (as we undoubtedly shou'd, had they been spoken figuratively) silences the Objection of the *Jews*, and insilts upon the Truth of the Bread's being *his Flesh*, in Words that ought to strike Terror into the Minds of those, who venture to doubt or deny it; give me Leave, My Lord, to repeat them to you once more *Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* When our Saviour speaks in this positive Manner, what Room is there left for Enquiry? What will it avail us to have Recourse to the Testimony of our Senses? The Almighty Lord of Hosts bears Testimony against them: His Evidence is of a Higher Nature, if it be not so clear to our Reason, it is of infinitely greater certainty to our Faith. And though this shou'd seem a *hard saying*, as it did to the *Jews*, Is it not much better to say with *Simon Peter*, at the Head of the twelve Apostles, *Lord to whom shall we go; thou hast the Words of Eternal Life:* Than depart from him, as some of his false Disciples did, and walk'd no more with him; because his Doctrine was, forsooth, beyond the Testimo-

Testimony of their Senses, or the Reach of their weak Reason?

Nor will your Lordship, I hope, think it of any Weight to say, that Christ did afterwards, Verse the 63. explain himself in a contrary Sense, when he said: *It is the Spirit that quickeneth the Flesh profiteth nothing. The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life*: For this was an Answer to those incredulous Disciples who murmur'd and said: *This is a hard saying*. They took his Words in a gross and Carnal Sense, and thought his Flesh was to be eaten in a *sensible Manner*, that is, as Flesh from the Shambles, or as they had the Day before eaten the Loaves and the Fishes, that he had miraculously multiply'd for their Nourishment. And it was therefore to disabuse these Faithless Disciples, and to let them know, that his Body was not to be kill'd, mangled or consumed by them, that he *verse 62.* Spoke to them of his Ascension into Heaven, in an impassible and glorified Manner such as he was to be eaten in.

For though the Body and Blood of Christ are *really* and *truly* in the Sacrament, Yet they are not only *really* and *truly* eaten and drank, but likewise *Spiritually*. For to be eaten in the Gross Manner those Disciples understood it, his Body must be dead, divisible, corruptible and changeable into another Substance; All which is repugnant to his State of Immortality and Impassibility, So that though his Body be as to it's *being* really and truly in the Sacrament, and really and truly eaten by the Faithful: Yet it is, as to the *Manner* of it, not only *Spiritually* in the Sacrament, but *Spiritually* eaten. Nor is there

F

any

any Contradiction in this, because the *Manner* of his Body's being in the Host, is not according to the usual Laws of Bodies but rather according to the *Idea* we have of the Being of Spirits: As *God* is in all Places, and as the *Soul* is present to the Body.

Nor if it were otherwise cou'd it *profit* us to Salvation to eat his Flesh in the gross Manner they understood it: For as the Body of Christ hath all it's Salutarious Qualities from his Spirit and Divinity, so it cannot profit or nourish our Souls unless it be received Spiritually that is, with a pure Heart and other Dispositions suitable to so heavenly a Food, for the unworthy Communicant, though he eats the true Flesh of Christ, eats Judgment and Death to himself for want of that *Spirit* that *quickneth*; that is for want of those Spiritual Dispositions that makes it Life to the worthy and well prepar'd Communicant. And I think it is plain, My Lord, that it is in this Sense that our Saviour's Words are *Spirit and Life*. And thus it was that St. *Augustin* understood them. *Tract. 27. in Joan.* "Quid est ergo: Non prodest quicquam Caro? Non prodest quicquam: Sed quomodo illi intellexerunt, quomodo in Cadavere dilaniatur, aut in Macello venditur: Non quomodo Spiritu Vegetatur. — Nam si Caro nihil prodesset Verbum Caro non fieret, ut inhabitaret in Nobis." *What Means: The Flesh profits nothing*, says St. *Augustin*. *It profits nothing*, viz. *As they understood it; as it is torn in Pieces in a Dead Body, or Sold in the Shambles; but it profits as animated by the Spirit.* — For if the *Flesh* profited nothing, the *Word* wou'd not have been made *Flesh*, that he might dwell in us.

And



And if these Words of our Saviour were to be understood to be an Explanation of the foregoing Words: *The Bread that I will give, &c.* So as to prove that he spoke Figuratively. Pray, My Lord, how can we believe the Disciples wou'd have taken such Offence as to go back, and never walk more with him, on Account of a Doctrine so easily understood; or where was the Need of *Simon Peter's* Solemn Profession of Faith, in his having the *Words of eternal Life, and his being Christ the Son of God*; in order to build his Faith upon, that the Bread he was to give, was no more than a mere Type, Figure, or Symbol of his Flesh? And does not this whole Behaviour of Christ, as well as of his Disciples, shew evidently that these Words. *The Bread that I will give is my Flesh*, are not as fairly to be accounted for in a Figurative Sense, as when he said: *I am the Vine, I am the Door*; and that notwithstanding this pretended Explanation, the *Capharnaïtes*, as well as some of his own Disciples still continued to believe he intended to give them his real Flesh; and thereupon went back from him; and that *Simon Peter* with the rest of the twelve, except perhaps *Judas*, did really and firmly believe they were to receive his real Flesh and drink his Blood, notwithstanding the seeming Difficulties, and Reluctance of their Senses; and that for this very good Reason, given by themselves, because they believed he was *Christ the Son of God*, and had the *Words of eternal Life*? And that there was no other Master to go to; neither Senses nor Reasonings, on which they cou'd depend so safely as on his Word, which was *Eternal Life*.

## Of the Real Presence

It is from hence, I think, manifest, that our Saviour did promise to give his real Flesh. Let us now see how he perform'd his Promise.

The three Evangelists, *Matthew* Cap. 26. 26. *Mark* Cap. 14. 22. and *Luke* Cap. 22. 19. give us this Account of it. *St. Matthew: And as they were eating, Jesus took Bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, take, eat, This is my Body. And He took the Cup, and gave Thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it: For this is my Blood of the new Testament which is shed for many for the Remission of Sins.*

I shall not trouble your Grace with the Words of the other two Evangelists, which you know very well to be the same in Substance as this, only that *St. Luke* adds to these Words: *This is my Body*, these other Words: *Which is given for you*. But I beg leave to Remark, that none of the Evangelists say: *Here is my Body*, but *This is my Body*. Had Christ said: *Here is my Body*. There would be Room left, to believe the Body of Christ was there together with the Bread; But since he said: *This is my Body*, to verify the Truth of this Proposition, the Bread must needs be changed into the Body of Christ; and the Apostles did believe it to be so: For since they did believe, and were persuaded; that Jesus Christ was true God, and true Man, that it was the Words of God, that created Heaven and Earth, that made all things of nothing; that by pronouncing these Words (*This is my Body*) he cou'd change that which was in his Hands, into his Body; as well as he did, by saying (*Fiat Lux, fiat Cælum & Terra*) create Heaven and Earth, or change them from Nothing to something; that therefore when he pronounced these

Words

Words (*This is my Body*) since there appear'd no Change in the Species or Accidents, to their Sight, or Touch, or Taste or Smell, as there ought not indeed, because the Institution was as well for a Sacrament, as for a Sacrifice; they concluded, the Change must necessarily be in the Substance of the *Bread*; and consequently that he gave them to eat not a *Typical*, or a *Figurative*, but his own true and real Body, Cloth'd with the Species or Appearances of Bread and Wine: Else wherein wou'd it be better than *Manna*, which was his *Typical* or *Figurative* Body in the Old Law? And of which Jesus Christ speaking, says, he would give better Bread: *Your Fathers did eat Manna in the Wilderness, and are Dead. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven; that a Man may eat thereof and not Die.* John 6. 49, 50. The *Manna* did not give Life, the Bread which Christ gave, did give Life, it was then much better. The *Manna* was the Figure of the Bread which Christ gave; the Bread then, which Christ gave must be the Reality, the Completion of that Figure. Now this it could not be, but must remain still a Figure, if not changed into his Body, which Christ himself was careful to declare, both at the Time he promised to give it, saying: *The Bread that I will give is my Flesh,* and at the Institution: *He took Bread, and blessed it, and brake it, saying: This is my Body.*

To this we may add the Doctrine of Sr. Paul in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Cap. 11. This great Apostle hearing of the Abuses crept in among these People in the Receiving of the blessed Sacrament. Recites in this Place, first, the Institution of it, as the *Evangelists* do; and



## Of the Real Presence

then lays before them the Danger of receiving, it unworthily. *Let a Man* (says he) *examin himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body.*

St. Paul did believe then, that it was the Lord's real, not Figurative Body; and would have the *Corinthians* to believe it was so too, why else should he threaten them with Damnation for taking it unworthily?

But to put this Matter still in a clearer Light, if possible, give me Leave, My Lord, to observe with the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers of the Church, that Christ was a Priest after the Order of *Melchisedec*. "*Juravit Dominus* (says the Prophet David) & non penitebit eum, tu es Sacerdos in æternum secundum Ordinem *Melchisedec*." The Lord hath Sworn, and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of *Melchisedec*. This Prophecy St. Paul repeats several Times in his Epistle to the Hebrews. Whither the Forerunner (says he) is for us entered, even Jesus made an High-Priest for ever after the Order of *Melchisedec*. Heb. Cap. 6. v. 20. If therefore Perfection were by the Levitical Priesthood (for under it the People received the Law) what further Need was there that another Priest shou'd rise after the Order of *Melchisedec*, and not be called after the Order of Aaron? For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of Necessity a Change of the Law. Cap. 7. 11. 12. That this *Melchisedec* who (as we read in *Genesis* Cap. 14.) was King of Salem, and Priest of the most high God, went forth to meet Abraham, upon his Return from the

the slaughter of the Kings there recorded, and offered a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine to God, blessed *Abraham*, and received Tithes from him. That it is an avowed Principle among Christians, and frequently repeated in the Scriptures, that Christ came to fulfil the Law, to bring it to Perfection, and to Perform in Truth and reality all the Types and Figures which had any Relation to him in the Books of *Moses*.

Now what could more nearly concern, or have stricter Relation to Him, than that very Man and his Sacrifice, after whose Order, he was made a Priest, and was the plainest and most manifest Type of his Priesthood and Sacrifice? Did it not then become him to perfect the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, that is, of the Bread and the Wine, and to make them the Truth and Reality of what they were Types, namely of his own Body and Blood? And had not he then Reason to promise the *Jews*, that the Bread he would give was his *Flesh*, and to say to his Apostles, when he performed this Promise at the last Supper: *This is my Body which is given for you. This is my Blood which is shed for you*, changing the Bread and the Wine that were in his Hands, by his Omnipotent Power, into his Body and Blood, and offering them to his Heavenly Father, in order to compleat and fulfil in Truth and reality the Sacrifice of him, of whose Order he was made a Priest for ever? This gave Occasion to *St. Cyprian* to say: *Quis magis Sacerdos Dei summi quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus? Qui Sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedec obtulerat, id est Panem & Vinum, suum scilicet Corpus & Sanguinem.*

## Of the Real Presence

That this was the Doctrine and Belief of the primitive Church, I shall in the Second Place, endeavour to make out from the *Liturgies* of the Eastern Churches above mentioned; and will make Use of them, as they are Done into English by Dr. Brett, as I did before, concerning the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*.

In the *Liturgy* of St. James, when the Priest has pronounced the Words of Consecration over the Bread and the Wine, viz. *This is my Body, which is broken, and given for you, for the Remission of Sins. This is my Blood of the new Testament, which is shed and given for you, and for many for the Remission of Sins.* After some Prayers he thus addresseth himself to Almighty God: *Send down, O Lord, this thy most holy Spirit upon us, and upon these holy Gifts here set before thee; that by his holy, good and glorious Presence, he may sanctifie, and make\* this Bread the Holy Body of thy Christ: And this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ.* And

---

\* N B. If these Words; *Make this Bread the Holy Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ,* be taken to the Letter they seem to infer, that the Greeks did not believe the *Transubstantiation* to be made till they were pronounced by the Priest. To which I answer, 1st. That when this very Thing was objected to the Greeks in the Council of Florence, They unanimously answer'd by the Mouth of *Isidorus* Metropolitan of Syria, and Legate of the Patriarch of Antioch, one of the seven deputed by the Greek Prelates to Dispute with the Latins; that all the Greeks did believe the Consecration to be made and the Change effected by the Words of Christ. *This is my Body: This is my Blood,* and that they differed only from the Latin Church, in the manner of explaining themselves; but that having found the said Prayer in the *Missals* of St. Basil and



And again a little before the Distribution of the Sacrament, he says: *Behold the Lamb of God, the Son of the Father that takes away Sins, and was sanctified for the Life and Salvation of the World.* And a little after, he adds: *Taste and see how gracious the Lord is, who is broken and not divided, is given to the Faithful and not consumed; for the Remission of Sins, and for everlasting Life, now and ever to eternal Ages.*

In the Liturgy of St. Mark, when in like Manner, the Priest has pronounced the Words of Consecration, viz. "For this is my Body, which is broken and given for the Remission of Sins. For this is my Blood of the new Testament, which is shed and given for you," and

St. Chrysostom, which they use and which were extant without any Alteration long before the Time of the Schism, they did not think fit to make any Change in them. It may not be amiss to subjoin *Isidorus* his own Words, as they were taken by the Interpreter in the said Council: "Hoc Missale quo utimur (*says he*) est traditum a *Basilio* et Beato *Chrysostomo*: utebatur autem eo ante tempus Schismatis, nec aliqua facta est Mutatio: tamen Occidentalis Ecclesia nunquam de hoc Verbum fecit, videlicet cum fuerimus concordēs, & ad eundem finem tendentes: Secundum rem dicimus idem, & credimus id quod conficit Mysterium esse Sermonem Domini, & dominicam Vocem esse effectricem divinatorum Munerum, & illa Vox semper explicatur a Sacerdote, & suscipit Sacerdos quod vox replicata aptetur, & sit eadem Vox cum Voce Domini; & ut ita aptetur, invocatur Spiritus Sanctus, & supplicat Sacerdos, ut per Virtutem Spiritus Sancti concedatur Gratis ut Vox repetita efficiatur ita effectiva, ut Verbum Dei sit; & ita credimus Consummativam fieri per illam Orationem Sacerdotis. Dominicae Voces habent Operationem ut Semina, quia sine Semine non potest effici fructus; ita in hac dominica Voce: tamen ubi cadit Semen, eget alijs

## Of the Real Presence

“ and for many, for the Remission of Sins: *He*  
 “ *adds, after a long Prayer, these Words:* Send  
 “ down thine holy Spirit upon us, and upon  
 “ these Loaves, and these Cups, that the  
 “ Almighty God may sanctify, and thorough-  
 “ ly to consecrate them, making the Bread the  
 “ Body, and the Cup the Blood of the new  
 “ Testament of our Lord himself, our God and  
 “ Supreme King Jesus Christ.” *And in another*  
*Prayer, he adds:* “ We bow down our selves,  
 “ both Soul and Body, before thee, testifying  
 “ thereby our Subjection to thee: And beseech  
 “ thee to defend us from all the secret Attacks  
 “ of Sin, and to make us Glad, with the divine  
 “ Influence of thine holy Spirit; so that being  
 “ filled with the Knowledge of thee, we may  
 “ wor-

---

“ Instrumentis, ut Sacerdotis, Altaris. Orationum,  
 “ Unde credimus per hoc vobiscum esse concordēs.”  
*This Missal which we make Use of (says he) was deliver'd*  
*to us from Basil, and the blessed Chrysostom: And we made*  
*Use of it before the Time of the Schism: Nor is there any*  
*Change made in it; yet the Western Church never made any*  
*Exception on this Head, in as much as we were of one Ac-*  
*cord and tending to the same End. We in reality say the*  
*same thing, and believe, that that which makes the Mystery*  
*is the Word of the Lord, and that the Word of our Lord pro-*  
*duces the divine Gifts, and that Word is always express'd*  
*by the Priest, and the Priest undertakes that the Word re-*  
*peated shou'd be adapted, and be the same Word with the*  
*Word of our Lord; and that it may be so adapted the Holy*  
*Ghost is invoked, and the Priest prays that by Virtue of the*  
*Holy Ghost, Grace may be granted, that the repeated Word*  
*may be made as effective, as the Word of God was; and so*  
*we believe it becomes accomplishing by that Prayer of the*  
*Priest. The Words of our Lord are operative as Seeds are, be-*  
*cause Fruit cannot be produced without Seed, so it is in this*  
*Word of our Lord: Yet where this Seed falls, it wants other*  
*Instrumentis, As of the Priest, of the Altar, and of Prayer.*  
*Whence we believe, we are by this of one Accord with you.*

“worthily partake of the good things lying before us, the spotless Body, and precious Blood of thine only begotten Son our Lord, our God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”

In the *Liturgy* of St. *John Chrysostom*, when the Priest has pronounced the Words of Consecration, as in the two former *Liturgies*, after a short Prayer to God he saith these Words: “We offer to thee this reasonable and unbloody Worship and beg, pray, beseech thee to send down thine holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts lying before thee——make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ——and what is in this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy holy Spirit.”

In  
2d. It is very probable, these Words: *Make this Bread, &c.* were in the Beginning (while the *Traditionary Form* was used, and for some time after) pronounced at the Altar, before the Words of Consecration, *Hoc est Corpus meum: This is my Body, &c.* And that by the Carelessness of the Copists in the primitive Times, it was transposed and inserted after the Words of Consecration; as *Bessarion Bishop of Nicea*, one of the seven *Greek Disputants*, seems to insinuate, in his *Treatise de Verbis Consecrationis*. where he says, that some of the *Oriental Writers* affirm the same. Besides, it is no small Argument of the Truth of this Transposition, that in the *Roman Missal* or *Liturgy* there is such another Prayer before the Words of Consecration in these Words. “*Quam Oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quasumus, Benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis Corpus, & Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filij tui Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, qui pridie quam pateretur, &c.*” Which Oblation do thou, O God, we beseech thee, vouchsafe to render in all Respects, blessed, approved, effectual, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may be made unto us the Body and Blood of thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who the Day before he suffer'd, &c.

But



## Of the Real Presence

In the *Liturgy* of St. *Basil* used in the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, when the Priest has pronounced the Words of Consecration as in the former *Liturgies*, he puts up this Prayer to God: "O Lord who didst send thy holy Spirit, to thy Apostles at the third Hour, take him not from us O Merciful God. And make in me a clean Heart O God, and renew a right Spirit within me— make this Bread the precious Body of our Lord, our God, and Saviour Jesus Christ. — And this Cup the precious Blood of our Lord our God, and Saviour Jesus Christ. — Which was shed for the Life of the World. — Changing them by thy holy Spirit."

And again a little after in the same *Liturgy*, we read these Words: "Let all Flesh be silent and stand with Fear and Trembling, laying aside all earthly Thoughts: For the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, comes forth to be Sacrificed, and given for Food to the Faithful, preceded by Choirs of Arch-Angels, Principalities and Powers, the many Ey'd Cherubim, and six winged Seraphim, who covering their Eyes, sing aloud *Allelujah*," In

---

But be this as it will, it is Evident to the Learned, that the *Greeks* and all the Orientals do now believe and have in all Ages believed, that the Bread and the Wine in the *Mas*s, are Changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, by virtue of the Words of Christ, *viz. This is my Body this is my Blood.* This manifestly appears by the *Ethiopian Liturgy* (of which we shall treat hereafter) where we read immediately after the Words of Consecration, and before the said Prayer, *make this Bread, &c.* Is pronounced, that the People, when they hear the Priest pronounces the Words of Consecration, *This is my Body, &c.* Say with a loud Voice, *Amen, Amen, Amen.* We believe and are Certain; we praise thee, O Lord our God; that is truly thy Body and so we believe.

In the same *Liturgy* as it is used throughout the Patriarchate of *Alexandria*; the Priest after pronouncing the Words of Consecration, as in the foregoing *Liturgies* maketh this Prayer: "Merciful and good Lord, we thy  
"Sinful and unworthy Servants, Pray, beseech,  
"and bow down ourselves to thee, that of thy  
"gracious Goodness, thou wilt send down thine  
"holy Spirit upon us thy Servants, and upon  
"these Gifts lying before thee, to bless them,  
"and make them the Holy of Holies. — That  
"he may make this Bread the holy Body of our  
"Lord our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for  
"the Remission of Sins, and Life everlasting, to  
"all those who partake of it. — And this  
"Cup the precious Blood of our Lord, our  
"God, and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the Re-  
"mission of Sins, &c. And again when he dis-  
"tributes the Sacrament, he saith these Words:  
"The holy Body and precious Blood of Jesus  
"Christ the Son of God, Amen. The People  
"say, Amen. The holy precious Body and  
"true Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God,  
"Amen. People, Amen. This is in Truth,  
"the Body and Blood of E M A N U E L, our  
"God, Amen."

In the *Liturgy* of the Church of *Ethiopia*, (I observ'd before that those, who use this *Liturgy* have revolted from the Church 1250. Years ago) when the Priest hath pronounced the Words of Consecration, after this Manner: Take eat ye all of this: This Bread is my Body which is broken for you, for the Remission of Sins, Amen. People, Amen, Amen, Amen. We believe and are certain; we praise thee O Lord our Lord; this is truly thy Body, and so we believe  
Priest.

## Of the Real Presence

Priest. Likewise also he bless'd and sanctified the Cup of Thanksgiving and said to them : *Take, drink ye all of this : This is the Cup of my Blood, which shall be shed for you, for the Redemption of many. Amen.*

People, *Amen. This is truly thy Blood and we believe it.*

Again, when the Priest is to receive the Sacrament, he saith these Words : *This is in Truth, the Body and Blood of Emanuel, Amen. I believe, I believe, I believe, from this Time forth, now and for evermore, Amen. This is the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which he received of the Lady of us all, the holy and pure Virgin Mary, and made it one with his Divinity† without any Commixtion or Confusion, any Division or Alteration of the Divinity.*

†This was  
Eutyches  
his Heresy.

In the *Liturgy of Nestorius*, (tho' he and his Sectators have revolted from the Church more than 1250. Years since) we read, that when the Priest has pronounced the Words of Consecration, as we find in all the other *Liturgies*, after a good many long Prayers, he putteth up this Prayer to Almighty God : “ We therefore, O  
“ Lord, thy vile, frail, and sinful Servants, who  
“ are alienated from thee, but through thy  
“ great Goodness made worthy to stand and  
“ Administer before thee, this tremendous, glorious and excellent Ministry, likewise implore  
“ thine adorable God-head, the Renewer of all  
“ Creatures, that the Grace of thine holy Spirit,  
“ O Lord, may come down, dwell, and rest upon this Sacrifice, which we offer unto thee,  
“ that it may sanctifie, and make it, viz. This  
“ Bread, and this Cup, the Body and Blood of  
“ our



“ our Lord Jesus Christ, changing and sancti-  
 “ fying them by thine holy Spirit.

In the *Liturgy* of *Severus*, who with his Secta-  
 tors have been out of the Church more than  
 1200. Years, we find that when the Priest hath  
 pronounced the usual Words of Consecration, and  
 the Oblation of the *Sacrifice*, he putteth up this  
 Prayer, which the *Rubrick* Calls the Invocati-  
 on of the Holy Ghost: “ Have Mercy on me,  
 “ O God, Father Almighty, ——— and send  
 “ down from thine holy Habitation the Para-  
 “ clete, thy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of  
 “ Life, ——— Send him down upon us, and up-  
 “ on these Offerings, and sanctifie them: That  
 “ this Bread may be made the Life-giving,  
 “ heavenly, saving Body, both of our Souls and  
 “ Bodies, even the Body of our Lord our God,  
 “ and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the Remission  
 “ of Sins, and everlasting Life, to all those  
 “ who partake of; and the Mixture in this  
 “ Cup, the Blood of the new Testament, the  
 “ Life-giving, saving Blood, even the Blood of  
 “ our Lord, our God, and King of all, Jesus  
 “ Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ever-  
 “ lasting Life, to all those who partake of it.”

These *Liturgies*, My Lord, are unexceptio-  
 nable Witnesses of the Faith and Practice of the  
 Church of Christ from the Beginning of Christi-  
 anity concerning the *Sacrament* and *Sacrifice* of  
 the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.  
 They tell us, that in this *Sacrifice* (to Summ up  
 the Evidence) The *Body* and *precious Blood*  
 of *Christ* are contained\*; that *Christ* is *broken*,  
 but not divided, is given to the Faithful, but not  
 consumed; that the Priest prays the Bread and  
 Wine may be thoroughly consecrated, and made  
 the

\* Saint  
 James his  
 Liturgy.

\* Saint  
Mark's.

† St. Chry-  
sostom's.

|| St. Basil's.

\* Liturgy  
of the  
Church of  
Ethiopia.

† Nestorius  
his Liturgy.

|| Severus  
his Liturgy.

2012 \*

2012 \*

the Body and Blood of Christ himself, and that he and the Faithful may be worthy to partake of the Spotless Body,\* and precious Blood of the only begotten Son of the Father: Prays also to God that the Gifts, viz. The Bread and Wine laid on the Altar, be made the precious Body, and precious Blood of Christ changing † them by his holy Spirit; that the same Words are express'd in another Liturgy,|| with this Addition: *Let all Flesh be silent, and stand with Fear and Trembling, laying aside all earthly Thoughts; for the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, comes forth to be Sacrificed, and given for Food to the Faithful; preceded by Choirs of Archangels, Principalities and Powers, &c* That the People in Answer to the Words of the Priest, say with the Oath, *Amen. This is in Truth the Body and Blood of Emanuel our God, Amen.* That upon the Priest's pronouncing the Words of Consecration over the Bread and Cup, the People answer\*: *Amen, Amen, Amen. We believe and are certain, this is truly thy Body, and so we believe: This is truly thy Blood, and we believe it.—This is the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ which he received of the Lady of us all, the holy and pure Virgin Mary.* That the Priests pray † the Gifts may be sanctified and changed: That they call the Sacrament, *the Life-giving, heavenly, saving Body, the Life giving saving Blood|| of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

These are, I think, My Lord, evident Testimonies for the Doctrine of the *real Presence* and *Transubstantiation* in the Sacrament, if the plainest Words are capable of making them so. Let us now, in the last Place, hear what the holy primitive

primitive Fathers in their Works, taught and held concerning the same.

As to the Passages, which I borrow from the *Greek* Fathers, I shall give them only in *English*, being necessitated thereto; because I know, there is a great deal of Difficulty in getting in this Town so many good *Greek* Types as wou'd be wanting for the Purpose; and as great in fitting them to the *Latin* or *English* Types; but to make Amends, I will fairly quote the Books, and Places whence they are taken, that your Grace may Judge whether I have done them Justice or not. The Words of the *Latin* Father's I will give in their own Language.

To begin with the *Greek* Fathers, *St. Ignatius, Epist. ad Smyrnen.* writes thus against the Hereticks of his Time: *They abstain from the Eucharist and from the publick Prayers, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffer'd for our Sins, and which the Father of his Goodness raised again from the Dead.*

*St. Cyril of Jerusalem. Mystagog. Catechis. 4.* taking his Text from these Words of *St. Paul: For I received of the Lord that which I also have deliver'd unto you,* speaks thus of the *Real Presence*, and of *Transubstantiation*: " This  
" Doctrine of the blessed *Paul*, may be sufficient  
" to satisfy you concerning the divine Mysteries  
" which you have received, that you have been  
" made partakers of the Body and Blood of  
" Christ. For he now says, that our Lord *Jesus Christ* in the same Night in which he was  
" betray'd, took Bread, and gave it to his  
" Disciples, saying, take, eat, THIS IS MY  
" BODY. And taking the Chalice, and giving  
G Thanks



## Of the Real Presence

“ Thanks, said : Take drink, **THIS IS MY**  
 “ **BLOOD.** Since Christ himself then did so  
 “ affirm and say of the Bread, *This is my Body,*  
 “ who shall, from thence forth presume to make  
 “ any Doubt of it ? And since he affirms and  
 “ says, *This is my Blood,* who, I say, shall doubt  
 “ and say it is not his Blood ? He once changed  
 “ Water into Wine, (which has some likeness  
 “ to Blood) in *Cana of Galilee*, by his own  
 “ Power : And shall he not be thought worthy  
 “ of Belief, in changing Wine into his Blood ?  
 “ Being invited to a corporal Wedding he  
 “ wrought this stupendious Miracle, and shall we  
 “ not much rather Confess that he gave his own  
 “ Body and Blood to the Children of the Bride-  
 “ groom ? Therefore with full Assurance let  
 “ us receive the Body and Blood of Christ : For  
 “ under the Type (or appearance) of Bread, the  
 “ Body is given unto thee, and under the Type  
 “ of Wine, the Blood ; that receiving the Body  
 “ and Blood of Christ thou may’st be Co-part-  
 “ ner with him of his Body and Blood. So shall  
 “ we be *Christophori*, Christ’s-Carriers, when we  
 “ receive his Body and Blood into our Mem-  
 “ bers ; and by this Means, as *St. Peter* saith, *be*  
 “ *made partakers of the divine Nature.*——  
 “ *Do not consider them then, as naked Bread and*  
 “ *naked Wine, for it is the Body and Blood of*  
 “ *Christ according to the Words of our Lord*  
 “ *himself.* For altho’ your Senses should sug-  
 “ gest this to you, yet let Faith confirm you,  
 “ judge not of the Thing by the Taste : but rather  
 “ be most certainly assured by Faith, so as to  
 “ leave no Room for a Doubt, that the Body  
 “ and Blood are given to thee.”

St. Gregory Nyssen. *Orat. Catechet. Cap. 37.*  
 Confirms the Doctrine of St. Cyril, where reasoning upon the Change of the Bread, which Christ ate, into his Flesh, He saith: *I do therefore in like Manner rightly believe that Bread which is Sanctified by the Word of God is changed into the Body of God the Word.*

St. Chrysostom, upon the 26th Chapter of St. Matthew Homil. 83. *Prope Fin.* Inculcates the same Doctrine. "Let us (*says he*) always believe God, neither must we resist him, altho' what he says may seem absurd to our Senses and Thoughts: Pray let his Words surpass our Sense or Reason, especially in all the Things which we do in the Mysteries, not only looking upon the things which lie before us, but also holding his Words. For we cannot be deceived by his Words, but our Senses are easily deceived: Those cannot be false, these are often, and often deceived: Therefore since he has said, *This is my Body*: Let no Doubt possess us, but let us believe it, and behold it with the Eyes of our understanding. ———  
 He was not content to be made Man, to be Scourged, but reduced us (as I may say) into one Masse or Lump with himself, and this not only by Faith, but, in very Deed maketh us his own Body. What ought then to be cleaner than him, who shall partake of this Sacrifice? What Rays of the Sun ought not those Hands to Exceed in Brightness, which handle this Crown, that Mouth which is fill'd with Spiritual Fire, that Tongue which is bloody with this admirable Blood? Call to mind with what Honour thou art dignified, of what Table thou partakest. For we are fed with that  
 G 2                      Thing,

“ Thing, which, when the Angels behold, tremble  
 “ neither can they without Fear see, by Reason  
 “ of the glory which cometh from thence ; and  
 “ we are reduced into one Masse with him,  
 “ Christ’s Body being one, and his Flesh one.  
 “ Who shall declare the Power of the Lord,  
 “ who shall make known his Praises : What  
 “ Shepherd feed his Sheep with his own Mem-  
 “ bers? Many Mothers when they bring forth  
 “ their Children give them to other Nurses,  
 “ which Christ would not do ; but feeds us  
 “ with his own proper Body, and joyns and  
 “ glues us to himself.”

To these *Greek* Fathers, I shall only add a  
 Passage taken out of St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* in  
 his Letter to *Nestorius* concerning Excommuni-  
 cation. This Letter with the twelve *Anathe-*  
*matisms* of the said Father was read and appro-  
 ved in the Council of *Ephesus*, so that the Doc-  
 trine it contains, was the Doctrine of all the  
 Orthodox Fathers of the Eastern Churches. Thus  
 he, then, speaketh of the *Sacrifice*, and of the  
*Real Presence* in the *Eucharist* : “ This also  
 “ (says he,) I cannot but add, in this Place,  
 “ namely, that when we preach the Death of the  
 “ only begotten Son of God, that is of Jesus  
 “ Christ, and his Resurrection from the Dead,  
 “ and Confess his Ascension into Heaven, we  
 “ celebrate the unbloody Sacrifice in the Church,  
 “ and do by this Means approach the Mystical  
 “ Benedictions, and are Sanctified ; being made  
 “ Partakers of the Sacred Flesh, and precious  
 “ Blood of Christ the Saviour of us all. And we  
 “ do not receive it as common Flesh *μη γινώσκοντες*  
 “ God forbid ; nor as the Flesh of a Man that is  
 “ sanctified, and joyned to the Word by an Uni-  
 “ ty



ty of Dignity, or as having a divine Habitation : But (we receive it) as it is truly, the " Life-giving and proper Flesh of the Word." Thus speak the *Greek* Fathers ; and the *Latin* Fathers hold the same Language.

Here I might produce several Passages from *St. Cyprian*, and from many other *Latin* Fathers, but to avoid being unnecessarily tedious, I will Instance only in four of the most eminent for Piety and Learning, viz. *St. Hilary*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Jerom*, and *St. Agustin*. Nor indeed is there any Need (wou'd but Men consult their Reason, and lay aside their Prejudices) of citing any more ; it being evident that what these great Men taught and practic'd, was the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church. To begin with *St. Hilary*.

This Father, *Lib. 8. de Trinitate*, proving that Christ is one with the Father ; saith : " Si  
" verè igitur Carnem Corporis nostri Christus  
" assumpsit, & verè Homo ille, qui ex *Maria* natus fuit, Christus est ; nosque verè sub Myfterio  
" Carnem Corporis sui sumimus, & per hoc unum erimus, quia Pater in eo est, & ille in nobis : Quomodo Voluntatis Unitas Afferitur, †  
" cum Naturalis per Sacramentum Proprietas perfectæ Sacramentum fit Unitatis ? Non est  
" humano aut Sæculi Sensu in Dei Rebus loquendum. Quæ Scripta sunt legamus, & quæ  
" legerimus, intelligamus, & tunc perfectæ Fidei Officio fungemur. De naturali enim in Nobis  
" Christi Veritate quæ dicimus, nisi ab eo discimus Stultè atque impiè dicimus. Ipse enim ait :  
" CARO MEA VERE EST ESCA, ET SANGUIS MEUS VERE EST POTUS.  
" De Veritate Carnis & Sanguinis non reliquus  
" est

† The Arians believed there was an Unity in Will only in the three Persons.

## Of the Real Presence

“ est ambigendi Locus: Nunc enim & ipſius  
 “ Domini Profeſſione, & Fide noſtra verè Caro  
 “ eſt, & verè Sanguis eſt. Et hæc accepta atque  
 “ haulta id efficiunt, ut & nos in Chriſto, &  
 “ Chriſtus in Nobis fit.” *Therefore if Chriſt did*  
*truly take to himſelf, the Fleſh of our Body, and*  
*that this Man, who was born of Mary is truly*  
*Chriſt, and that we truly take under a Myſtery or*  
*Vail the Fleſh of his Body, and by this will be*  
*one, becauſe the Father is in him, and He in us:*  
*How is the Unity of Will aſſerted, Since the na-*  
*tural Propriety by the Sacrament is a Sacrament*  
*of perfect Unity? We muſt not ſpeak with human*  
*or wordly Senſe in the Things of God. Let us*  
*read the Things that are written, and let us un-*  
*derſtand what we read, and then we ſhall diſ-*  
*charge the Office of perfect Faith. For what we*  
*ſay of the natural Truth of Chriſt in us, except*  
*we learn it from himſelf, we fooliſhly, and impi-*  
*ouſly ſay. For he ſaith: MY FLESH IS TRU-*  
*LY FOOD, AND MY BLOOD IS TRU-*  
*LY DRINK: There is no Room left to doubt*  
*of the Truth of his Fleſh and Blood: For now*  
*both by the Declaration of our Lord himſelf, and*  
*by our Faith, it is truly Fleſh; and truly Blood.*  
*And when we eat and drink them, they cauſe*  
*that both we are in Chriſt, and Chriſt is in us.*

St. Ambroſe, Lib. de his qui Myſterijs initi-  
 antur Cap. 9. To inſtruct his People in the  
 Doctrine of the Real Preſence, and of Tran-  
 ſubſtantiation, Inſtances in ſeveral Miracles,  
 wrought by Moſes and other Prophets, or ra-  
 ther by Almighty God at the Requeſt of Moſes  
 and the Prophets; as of Aaron's Rod changed  
 into a Serpent, of the Serpent again changed  
 into the ſame Rod: Of the Waters of the River  
 Nile

Nile changed into Blood : Of the Waters of the Red-Sea divided, congeal'd, and standing as Walls, and affording the *Israelites* a Passage dry Shod : Of *Moses* striking the Rock, whence Water flow'd : Of the *Iron* of the *Ax* swimming on the Water, in the Days of the Prophet *Eli-seus*. Whence St. *Ambrose* reasons after this Manner : " Quod si tantum valuit humana Bene-  
 " dictio ut Naturam converteret ; quid dicimus  
 " de ipsa Consecratione divina, ubi verba ipsa  
 " Domini salvatoris operantur ? Nam Sacramen-  
 " tum istud quod accipitis Christi Sermonem Con-  
 " ficitur. Quod si tantum valuit Sermo *Eliæ*,  
 " ut Ignem de Cœlo deponeret, non valebit  
 " Christi Sermo ut species mutet Elementorum ?  
 " De totius Mundi Operibus Legisti : Quia ipse  
 " dixit, & facta sunt, ipse mandavit & creata  
 " sunt. Sermo ergo Christi qui potuit ex nihilo  
 " facere quod non erat, non potest ea quæ sunt  
 " in id mutare quod non erant ? Non enim mi-  
 " nus est novas Rebus dare quam mutare Natu-  
 " ras." Now if human Blessing was so power-  
 ful as to change Nature ; what shall we say of  
 the divine Consecration, where the very Words  
 of our Lord and Saviour operate ? For that  
 Sacrament which you receive is made by the  
 Word of Christ. And if the Word of *Elias* was  
 so powerful as to bring down Fire from Heaven :  
 Will not the Word of Christ be able to change the  
 Species (or Nature) of the Elements ? You have  
 read of the Works of the whole world. He said, and  
 they were made, he commanded and they were  
 created. Cannot then the Word of Christ, who  
 cou'd make of nothing, that which was not,  
 change the Things which are, into that which  
 they were not ? For it is not less to give new



## Of the Real Presence

*Natures to Things, than to change their Natures.*

St. Jerome, Epist. ad Hedibiam in Answer to her second Question, writeth thus concerning the Real Presence: "Si ergo Panis qui de Cœlo descendit, Corpus est Domini: Et Vinum quod Discipulis dedit, Sanguis illius est novi Testamenti, qui pro multis effusus est, in Remissionem Pecatorum: *Judaicas Fabulas repellamus, & ascendamus cum Domino Cœnaculum magnum, Istratum atque mundatum: Et accipiamus ab eo sursum Calicem novi Testamenti: Ibique cum eo Pascha celebrantes inebriemur ab eo Vino Sobrietatis. Non enim est Regnum Dei Cibus & Potus, sed Justitia, & Gaudium, & Pax in Spiritu Sancto. Nec Moyses dedit nobis Panem verum, sed Dominus Jesus: Ipse Conviva & Convivium, ipse se comedens, & qui comeditur. Illius bibimus Sanguinem, & sine ipso potare non possumus; & quotidie in Sacrificijs ejus de Genimine Viris vera, & Vinea Sorec quæ interpretatur, Electa, rubentia Musta calcamus: Et novum ex his Vinum bibimus de Regno Patris, nequaquam in Vetustate Literæ sed in Novitate Spiritus Cantantes Canticum novum: Quod nemo potest cantare, nisi in Regno Ecclesiæ, quod Regnum Patris est.*" *If then the Bread which came down from Heaven, is the Lord's Body: And the Wine which he gave his Disciples, is his Blood of the Testament, which was shed for many for the Remission of Sins: Let us reject the Jewish Fables, and let us go up with the Lord to the great Room furnish'd and swept: And let us receive from him above the Chalice of the new Testament, and celebrating there with him*

him the Passeeover, let us be drunk with that Wine of Sobriety. For the Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, but Justice, and Joy, and Peace in the Holy Ghost. Nor did Moles give us the true Bread, but the Lord Jesus: He himself being the Guest and the Banquet. He himself Eating and was eaten. We drink his Blood, and without him we cannot drink; and we daily in his Sacrifices of the Generation of the true Vine, and of the choice Vineyard, tread ruddy Must: And we drink, out of these, New Wine of the Fathers Kingdom, not in the oldness of the Letter, but in the newness of the Spirit: Singing a new Song, which no Body can sing, but in the Kingdom of the Church, which is the Kingdom of the Father.

St. Austin, Enar. in Psal. 33. Commenting upon these Words of the Septuagint: *Ferebatur in Manibus suis*, says as plain as Words can make it, that tho' David could not carry himself in his Hands according to the Letter, yet that Christ did. "Et ferebatur, says he, in Manibus suis. Hoc vero Fratres, quomodo possit fieri in Homine, quis intelligat? Quis enim portatur in Manibus suis? Manibus aliorum potest portari Homo, Manibus suis Nemo portatur. Quomodo intelligatur in ipso David secundum Literam non invenimus, in Christo autem invenimus. Ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis, quando comedans ipsum Corpus suum, ait, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM. Ferebat enim illud Corpus in Manibus suis." And he was carried in his own Hands. How this could be done in Man, Brethren, who can understand? For what Man is carried in his own Hands? Man can be carried

## Of the Real Presence.

ried in the Hands of others, in his own Hands no Man is carried. How this may be understood in David, according to the Letter, we do not find, but in Christ we find it. For Christ was carried in his own Hands: When commending his own very Body, he said: **THIS IS MY BODY.** For he carried that Body in his Hands.

If Zuinglius or Beza were to explain this Text, they would tell St. Austin, he was a mere Simpleton, for keeping such a sputter about nothing; for that Christ might as well carry the Body which he gave to his Disciples in his Hands, as any King or Prince might carry his own Picture: But the Difference between St. Austin and these Gentlemen is, that St. Austin did believe Christ carried his own true and real Body in his Hands; and that no Man else could carry his own Body in his Hands, but one of an Omnipotent Power, whereas these Gentlemen believed any Man may do what Christ did; because they believed Christ carried his Body only Figuratively, Sacramentally, Representatively, &c. Pray, My Lord, are these Holy Fathers of the Greek and Latin Church to be charged with Idolatry? They agree most harmoniously among themselves and with us, in their Belief and Practice upon this Head. Their Words are too plain and clear to be construed in, or wrested to any other Sense, than that in which we understand them. Be pleas'd then, My Lord; either to acquit us of the Charge of Idolatry, or you will necessarily Eclipse the greatest and most shining Luminaries of the Church, in branding them with the foulest and most abominable of Crimes.

Thus



Thus much concerning the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers. But there is another Reason that convinces me, the whole Catholick Church of Christ did believe the *Real Presence* and *Transubstantiation* in the Sacrament, viz. The Adoration of true *Latria*, which the *Greeks* and *Latins* gave it in all Ages. For if they had not believed that the Bread and the Wine were changed into the real Body and Blood of Christ, and that the Sacrament did also contain (by Concomitance) his Soul and Divinity, they wou'd be guilty of gross Idolatry, such as your Grace charges us with) for giving it the Honour that is due to God alone.

*Monsieur L' Abbe' Renaudot*, who, by his Skill in the *Oriental* Languages, and his indefatigable Labour, has brought to light many curious Monuments of Antiquity, which lay buried in unknown Languages, laid up in Manuscripts, in several Libraries in *Europe*: And who, was a Man of that Integrity and Candor, that he does not quote a Passage out of any Author or Manuscript, without telling the Name of the Author, his Qualifications, the Books he wrote, and where they are to be found; nor out of any Manuscript, without marking the Library where it is to be found, and the Language in which it is written; so that it is plain he would not impose upon any Man.

This learned Man, I say, gives us an ample Account of the *Adoration* which the Eastern Christians paid the blessed Sacrament, in the third Book, and third Chapter of his fourth Volume of the *Perpetuity of the Faith*, &c. It were tedious to repeat here all that he says upon this Head; for then I must have transcribed twelve

Pages

Pages of a large *Quarto*: I shall therefore, instance only in two or three Passages borrowed from the said Chapter. *Simeon of Thessalonica*, says, *Monsieur Renaudot*, flourished before the Time of the Council of *Florence*, and was in great Repute among the *Greeks*. This Father tells us, that when the Priest or Deacon has said with a loud Voice τὰ ἁγία τοῖς ἁγίοις, *Holy Things are for the Holy*; when the Bishop, the Priests, and the Deacons have received, and when the Body and Blood are mix'd together in the Chalice for the Communicants: The Priest or Deacon, carries (they are *Simeon's* own Words) the sacred Reliques of the divine Bread, in the sacred Chalice. He shews them to all the People, That is, he shews *Jesus Christ*, and that which is his proper Body, and his true Blood, which he has sacrificed for us his purchased People; which he gives us, and permits us to Taste, to See, and to Feel. Wherefore the holy People see him with the Soul, they adore him, and ask of him whatever is necessary for their Salvation.

And a little after, continues he, they ought to prostrate themselves on the Ground, and to adore, with all their Souls, the living Bread, which with the Blood, is in the Chalice.

*Monsieur Renaudot*, in the same Chapter tells us, that many *Coptick Manuscripts* speak of the Adoration of the Sacrament in the same Manner. These are their Words: The Priest takes the *Asbodicon*, that is ὁ ἅγιος δισκός. The Body of the Lord, and raises it up as high as he can, crying out aloud, **HOLY THINGS FOR THE HOLY**; and in another Exemplar, adds, in which the Rites, according to the Ritual of the Patriarch *Gabriel*,

*bric*, are marked: The Priest lifteth up the Body of our Lord, stretcheth out his Hands, and bows his Head. Then cries with a loud Voice. **HOLY THINGS FOR THE HOLY**; In the mean Time all those who are present shall prostrate themselves on their Faces to the Ground.

Again he adds: *In the Ritual of the Patriarch Gabriel the Manner of giving the Communion is thus prescribed*: "The Deacon shall take the Chalice, and carry it first to the South side, accompanied by another Deacon holding in his Hand a burning Taper; all the Ministers, who serve at the Altar, shall adore it, bowing their Heads, till the Deacon comes to the North side. At the same Time, the Priest holding the *Paten* on which is laid the Bread consecrated into the Body of Jesus Christ, and turning his Face to the *West*, cometh down from the Sanctuary, giveth the Benediction to the People, making the Sign of the Cross with the *Paten*, and all of them Great and Small, shall adore and bow down to the Ground. Then he begins to give the Communion. Every Layman, as he receives, shall bow down to the Ground, before the Altar of God, and each one that receives shall uncover his Head. When the Men have received, the Priest gives the Benediction, as before, with the *Paten*, and goes to the Place where the Women are, with a Deacon going before, holding a burning Taper. And as he passes by, all the Laity uncover their Heads, and prostrate themselves before God. — When the Priest comes to the Place where the Women are, before he gives them the Communion,



“ munion, he gives them the Benediction, as  
 “ before with the *Paten*. And after the same  
 “ Manner, when he comes back to the Altar, he  
 “ turns about to the *West*, and gives the Bene-  
 “ diction to the People, who, at the same Time,  
 “ bow down to the Ground, and adore the Lord,  
 “ crying: REMEMBER US O LORD,  
 “ WHEN THOU COMEST INTO  
 “ THY KINGDOM.”

Thus much I think may suffice out of a great  
 deal more, which this learned *Man Monsieur Re-*  
*naudot* extracted out of the *Oriental Manuscript,*  
*Liturgies* and *Rituals*, that have any *Rubricks*  
 in them; and gives this solid Reason, why he  
 could not borrow any Proof of the Adoration of  
 the Sacrament, from the most ancient *Liturgies*;  
 because there were no *Rubricks* annexed to  
 them from the Beginning, to direct how or  
 when they were to adore; the Ancients being  
 content with the traditionary Method, of adoring  
 Christ in the Sacrament, as they were taught by  
 the Mouth of their Pastors, and as natural Rea-  
 son guided them to adore the Sacrament, which  
 they believed to be the true Body and precious  
 Blood of Jesus Christ, and as often as they  
 saw it, or when it was presented to them, till  
 in latter Ages, for a greater Uniformity in Prac-  
 tice, and Worship, *Rubricks* were annexed to  
 such *Liturgies*, and *Rituals*, as were used in  
 the great Churches, or Patriarchal Seats, and  
 by Degrees, all other Churches follow'd their  
 Example. Nor do we find any *Rubricks* in the  
 most ancient *Roman Manuscripts*, *Missals*, or  
*Ordinals*; and yet it is certain all the People  
 of the *Western* or *Latin Church*, as I shall prove  
 immediately by the Words of *St. Austin*, and  
 St.

St. *Ambrose*, did always adore the Blessed Sacrament, wherever they saw, or met with it; Neither can it be prov'd by any Words contained in the present *Roman Missal*, that the Sacrament is to be adored, but by the *Rubricks*; Nor do the little People know any thing of such *Rubricks*; and yet they fall on their Knees at the Elevation of the *Host* and *Chalice*, and whenever they see the Sacrament; because they are sensible, it is a natural Consequence of their Belief of the *Real Presence* to adore *Jesus Christ*, as often as they see Him. Let us hear what St. *Austin* says on this Subject. It is taken out of his *Enarat. in Psal. 98.* upon these Words of *David*: "*Exaltate Dominum Deum nostrum;*  
 "*Et adorate Scabellum Pedum ejus quoniam*  
 "*Sanctum est. Quid (says he) habemus adora-*  
 "*re? Scabellum Pedum ejus. Suppedaneum*  
 "*dicitur Scabellum. Quod dicunt Græci Hy-*  
 "*popodion, dixerunt Latini Scabellum: Et alij*  
 "*dixerunt Suppedaneum. Sed videte Fratres*  
 "*quid nos jubet adorare. Alio Loco Scriptura*  
 "*dicit, Cælum mihi Sedes est, Terra autem*  
 "*Scabellum Pedum meorum. ergo Terram nos*  
 "*jubet adorare, quia dixit alio Loco quod sit*  
 "*Scabellum Pedum Dei: Et quomodo adora-*  
 "*bimus Terram, cum dicat appertè Scriptura,*  
 "*Dominum Deum tuum adorabis: Et hic dicit,*  
 "*Adorate Scabellum Pedum ejus? Exponens*  
 "*autem mihi quid sit Scabellum Pedum ejus,*  
 "*dicit, Terra autem Scabellum Pedum meorum,*  
 "*Anceps factus sum: Timeo adorare Terram,*  
 "*ne damnet me qui fecit Cælum & Terram.*  
 "*Rursum timeo non adorare Scabellum Pedum*  
 "*Domini mei, quia Psalmus mihi dicit. Adorate*  
 "*Scabellum Pedum ejus. Quæro quid sit*  
 "*Scabellum*

## Of the Real Presence

" Scabellum Pedum ejus, & dicit mihi Scriptura  
 " ra, Terra Scabellum Pedum meorum. Fluctu-  
 " ans converto me ad Christum, quia ipsum qua-  
 " ro hic, & invenio quomodo sine impietate a-  
 " doretur Terra, sine Impietate adoretur Scabel-  
 " lum Pedum ejus. Suscepit enim de Terra Ter-  
 " ram, quia Caro de Terra est, & de Carne  
 " Maria Carnem accepit. Et quia ipsa Carne  
 " hic ambulavit, & ipsam Carnem nobis mandu-  
 " candam ad Salutem dedit: Nemo autem illam  
 " Carnem manducat nisi prius adoraverit. In-  
 " ventum est quemadmodum adoretur tale Sca-  
 " bellum Pedum Domini, & non solum non pec-  
 " cemus adorando, sed peccemus non adoran-  
 " do."

*Exalt ye the Lord our God: And adore ye  
 his Footstool, because it is holy. What have we to  
 adore? His Footstool: What is set under our  
 Feet is called a Footstool. That which the Greeks  
 call Hypopodion, the Latins call Scabellum:  
 And others call it Suppedaneum. But behold  
 Brethern, what he commands us to adore. In  
 another Place the Scripture saith: Heaven is my  
 Seat, and the Earth my Footstool. He com-  
 mands us then to adore the Earth, because he  
 said in another Place that it is God's Footstool.  
 And how shall we adore the Earth, since the  
 Scripture expressly saith: Thou shalt adore the  
 Lord thy God: And here saith: Adore ye his  
 Footstool. But expounding unto me, what is  
 his Footstool, he saith: The Earth is my Foot-  
 stool. I am in doubt: I fear to adore the  
 Earth, lest he should damn me, who made Hea-  
 ven and Earth. Again, I am afraid not to  
 adore the Footstool of my Lord, because the  
 Psalm saith unto me: Adore his Footstool. I*

ask



ask what is his Footstool? And the Scripture tells me: The Earth is his Footstool. In this Perplexity, I turn my self to Christ, because I seek him here, and I find how the Earth may be adored without Impiety. how his Footstool may be adored without Impiety. For he took Earth from the Earth, because Flesh is from the Earth, and he took Flesh from Mary's Flesh. And because he walked here in that Flesh, and gave us that Flesh to Eat for our Salvation: But no Man eateth that Flesh except he first adore it; It is found how we may adore such a Footstool of the Lord, and we do not only not Sin in adoring, but shoud Sin in not adoring it. Saint Ambrose, Lib 3. de Spir. Sancto. Cap. 12. Upon the same Words, saith. "Ita per Scabellum Terra intelligitur, per Terram autem Caro Christi, quam hodie quoque in Mysterijs adoramus, & quam Apostoli in Domino Jesu, ut supra diximus, adorarunt." So by Footstool, the Earth is understood, and by the Earth, the Flesh of Christ, which Flesh we do even this Day adore in the Mysteries, and which the Apostles did adore in the Lord Jesus, as we said above.

By this Time I hope My Lord, your Grace is satisfied, we have good Grounds to believe the Real Presence, and Transubstantiation, which is the "Lapis Offensiones, & Petra scandali:" A Stone of stumbling, and a Rock of Offence: But the Stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the Head of the Corner. Luke 20. 17.

As to the Real Presence, I must own, I cannot gather from what your Grace says in the Charitable Address, that you do believe it; on the contrary you seem not to believe it, by the Comparison you make Pag. 27. between the

Words of Christ *I am the Vine*, &c. and, *This is my Body*, which your Grace says, may be as fairly accounted for, as when he says, *I am the Vine*, &c. But be that as it will. I am sure a great many learned Bishops and Divines of your Grace's Communion have believed the *Real Presence*, and taught it in as express Terms as any Roman Catholick whatsoever. I have not their Books by me, to give their Quotations as they lye; But shall borrow them from a Book Intituled: *An Essay towards a Proposal for Catholick Communion*, and Repeated by Mr. *Spinckes* in his Answer to the said Book, who would not fail to expose their Falshood, had there been any.

In Mr. *Spinckes* his Edition Pag. 104. We read these Words: *What King James the first, and Bishop Andrews believed in this Point may be seen in the Answer to Cardinal Bellarmin's Apology* Cap. 1. "De hoc est, Fide firma tenemus, quod sit: Presentiam, inquam, credimus nec minus quam vos veram." We believe a true Presence as much as you. And we have the same in *Casaubon's Letter*, written also by the King's Command to Cardinal Per-  
ron.

"Bishop *Montague's* Appeal may be next seen, Chap. 30. the Contents of which is thus: A *Real Presence* is maintain'd by us. The Difference betwixt us and Popish Writers is only about the *Modus* of Christ's Presence in the Blessed Sacrament. Agreement is likely to be made, but for the factious and unquiet Spirits on both Sides. *Beati Pacifici*. And in the Body of the Chapter he speaks thus to the Informers his Adversaries: *The Real Presence* in

" in your Divinity, is flat Popery, but not in the  
 " Divinity of the Church of England. Concerning  
 " this Point I said, and I say so still, that if Men  
 " were disposed as they ought, unto Peace there  
 " need be no Difference. And I added a Reason  
 " which I repeat again here : The Disagree-  
 " ment is only in *de Modo Præsentie*. The  
 " Thing is yielded to on either Side, that there  
 " is in the holy Eucharist a Real Presence. God  
 " forbid saith Bishop Bilson, we should deny, that  
 " the Flesh and Blood of God, are truly pre-  
 " sent, and truly received of the Faithful at the  
 " Lord's Table. It is the Doctrine that we  
 " teach others, and comfort ourselves withal ;  
 " and the Reverend and learned Answerer unto  
 " Bellarmin's Apology cometh home to the  
 " Faith or Popery, if you will, condemned in  
 " B. Montague, who learned it from him, and  
 " such as he is. *Nobis vobiscum de Objecto*  
 " *Convenit, de Modo Lis est. Præsentiam,*  
 " *inquam, credimus non minus quam vos, veram*  
 " *de Modo Præsentie nil temere definimus.* And  
 " to them agreeth Bishop Morton. The Questi-  
 " on is not concerning a Real Presence, which  
 " Protestants do also profess. *Fortunatus a*  
 " *Protestant* holding that Christ is in the Sacra-  
 " ment most really *verissimè realissimèque* Are his  
 " Words. In these Words does B. Mountague  
 " declare and defend his Belief of the Real  
 " Presence.  
 " Arch-Bishop Laud, besides what was noted  
 " from him before out of his Speech in the  
 " Star chamber, gives there also this Reason  
 " drawn from the Real Presence, for Reverence  
 " to the Altar, as being upon this Account the  
 " greatest Place of God's Residence upon Earth.



" I say, saith he, the greatest, yea greater than the  
 " Pulpit. For there 'tis, *HOC EST CORPUS*  
 " *MEUM. THIS IS MY BODY.* But in the  
 " Pulpit, 'tis at most but *Hoc est Verbum Meum,*  
 " *This is my Word,* And a greater Reverence  
 " (no doubt) is due to the Body, than to the  
 " Word of our Lord. And so in Relation, an-  
 " swerably to the Throne, where his Body is  
 " usually present, than to the Seat, whence his  
 " Word useth to be proclaimed *P. 47.* And  
 " elsewhere in his Conference with *Fisher § 35.*  
 " *N. 6. Punct. 4.* he quotes Bishop *Ridley's*  
 " Confession set down by *Fox, Pag. 1598.* in  
 " those Words: You (*the Papists*) and I agree in  
 " this, that in the Sacrament is the very true and  
 " natural Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, even  
 " that which was born of the Virgin *Mary,*  
 " which ascended into Heaven which sits on  
 " the right Hand of God the Father, &c. Only  
 " we differ in the Way and Manner of being  
 " there. Add to these, Bishop *Ken's* Exposition  
 " Licenced, 1685. O God incarnate, how thou  
 " canst give us thy Flesh to Eat, and thy Blood  
 " to drink, how thy Flesh is Meat indeed; how  
 " thou who art in Heaven, art present at the  
 " Altar, I can by no Means explain, but I firmly  
 " believe it all, because thou hast said it, and  
 " I firmly rely on thy Love, and on thy Omnipot-  
 " ence to make good thy Word, tho' the Man-  
 " ner of doing it, I cannot comprehend."

Again *Pag. 105.* He adds: Bishop *Andrews,*  
 as above *Chap. 8. Pag. 194.* "*Rex Christum*  
 "*in Eucharistia verè præsentem, verè & ado-*  
 "*randum statuit.* And, *Nos vero in Mysterijs*  
 "*Carnem Christi adoramus cum Ambrosio, &c.*  
 " The King (he speaks of King *James* the first)  
 " acknow-

“ acknowledges Christ to be truly present, and  
 “ truly to be adored in the *Eucharist*. I also  
 “ with St. *Ambrose* adore the Flesh of Christ in  
 “ the Mysteries.

“ Bishop *Forbes de Eucharistia, Lib. 2.*  
 “ *Cap. 2. §. 9. An Christus in Eucharistia sit*  
 “ *adorandus, Protestantés saniores non dubitant,*  
 “ *in sumptione enim Eucharistiae adorandus est*  
 “ *Christus vera Latria. And §. 8. Immanis est*  
 “ *Rigidorum Protestantium Error, qui negant*  
 “ *Christum in Eucharistia esse adorandum, nisi*  
 “ *Adoratione interna & mentali, non autem ex-*  
 “ *terno aliquo Ritu Adorativo, ut in Genucula-*  
 “ *tione, aut aliquo alio consimili Corporis situ.*  
 “ *Hi ferè omnes malè de Præsentia Christi Domi-*  
 “ *ni in Sacramento, miro sed vero Modo præ-*  
 “ *sens, sentiunt.* The sounder Protestants, make  
 “ no doubt of adoring Christ in the *Eucharist*.  
 “ For in receiving the *Eucharist* Christ is to be  
 “ adored with true *Latria*. 'Tis a monstrous  
 “ Error of the rigid Protestants, who deny that  
 “ Christ is to be adored in the *Eucharist*, except  
 “ only with an inward Adoration of the Mind,  
 “ but not with an outward Act of Adoration as  
 “ Kneeling or other like Posture of the Bo-  
 “ dy. All these do not believe a right of the  
 “ Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, present  
 “ there after a wonderful, but real Manner.”

“ Mr. *Thorndike. Epil. Lib. 3. Cap. 30.*  
 “ *Pag. 350.* I suppose, says he, the Body and  
 “ Blood of Christ may be adored wheresoever  
 “ they are; and must be adored by a good Christi-  
 “ an where the Custom of the Church, which a  
 “ Christian is obliged to Communicate with,  
 “ requires it. And is not the Presence thereof in  
 “ the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, a just Occasi-

“ on, presently to expresse by that bodily Act of  
 “ Adoration, that inward Honour which we al-  
 “ ways carry towards our Lord *Christ* as God,  
 “ Pag. 350. Not to baulk that Freedom, says  
 “ he, which hath carrid me to publish all this;  
 “ I do believe that it was so practiced, and done  
 “ in the ancient Church, and, in the Sym-  
 “ bols, before receiving : Which I maintain  
 “ from the Beginning to have been the true  
 “ Church of *Christ*, obliging all to conform to  
 “ it, in all things within the Power of it.”

These Quotations borrowed from your own Divines, My Lord, are so full and plain that they need no Comment. I shall therefore beg leave to ask your Grace, whether any Divine of the Church of *Rome* can teach the *Real Presence*, or the Adoration of *Christ*'s Body and Blood in the Sacrament, in more precise and expresse Terms, than these great and learned Men of your own Church have done ; or whether it is possible to find Words that would explain that Doctrine more fully, or more plainly ?

But let us hear what Mr. *Spinckes* says, in Answer to these great Divines. It is, indeed, pleasant to observe how he dispatches all that they say of the Adoration of the Sacrament, in a few Words : *Nor will* (says he Pag. 118.) *his former Citation* (speaking of the Author of the *Essay*) *out of Bishop Andrews make any Alteration herein. For he only professes the King to own that Christ is truly present, and to be adored in the Eucharist. And indeed what properer Time of paying him our devoutest and most humble Adoration than when he condescends to meet us in this holy Ordinance.*



*Christ is truly present, and is to be adored in the Eucharist. In receiving the Eucharist, Christ is to be adored with true Latria: It is a monstrous Error of the rigid Protestants, who deny that Christ is to be adored in the Sacrament. We may pay him our devoutest and most humble Adoration when he Condescends to meet us in this holy Ordinance, says Mr. Spinckes. He is there then truly present. He is to be adored with true Latria. He meets us there. He is there to be adored in the devoutest Manner. And do the Roman Catholicks say any More? Or can they say any more, or express their Thoughts in stronger or more energick Terms?*

*Is it then Idolatry to adore Jesus Christ in the Eucharist? Is not Christ true God and true Man, truly present in the Eucharist? Your own great Divines acknowledge he is, and so does Mr. Spinckes: Is not he then to be adored with true Latria, wherever he condescends to meet us? Yes, says Mr. Spinckes, after the great Divines above cited. Is it then Idolatry in us to do what your own greatest Men say is the Duty of every good Christian? Either then, My Lord, be pleased to Discard your own Divines, and Mr. Spinckes too, or allow our Practice on this Subject to be good and lawful.*

*Possibly your Grace may say: We (the Catholicks) not only worship Christ in the Sacrament but also the Elements too. To which I answer, if your Grace means by the Elements the Bread and Wine, and maintain they still remain in the Sacrament after the Consecration, wherein do you differ from the Lutherans? For they maintain as your greatest Divines do, that Christ is truly present in the Sacrament, and*

that the Bread and the Wine are there also ; and therefore coined that new Term *Consubstantiation*, which your Divines call a Monstrous Doctrine ; and yet if Christ be truly present in the Sacrament, and that the Bread and the Wine be there too : The Doctrine of *Consubstantiation* is an inevitable and necessary Consequence of that Principle. But if by the *Elements* your Grace Means, the Species or outward Appearances of the Bread and the Wine, I answer that we worship them, after the same Manner, as a Man does the Royal Robes, which the King wears, when he comes to worship him as God's Vicegerent on Earth : And, as your Grace very well knows, that the Worship or Respect intended by this Man terminates not in the Robes but in the Person of the King, tho' known by his Robes ; so we terminate the Worship of true *Latria*, as your own Divines together with us call it, which we pay when we see the Sacrament not in the Species, or outward Appearances, by whose Means we know the Sacrament ; but in the Person of Jesus Christ himself.

Thus much, I hope, My Lord, may suffice to satisfy your Grace, that we do not blindly, nor without good Reason, believe the *Real Presence* and *Transubstantiation*, nor practice, without good Authority, the Adoration or Worship of true *Latria*, which we pay *Christ* in the Sacrament. I shall now return to answer the Exceptions which your Grace, in the 24th, 25th. and 26th. Paragraphs, takes to our Doctrine concerning *Transubstantiation*, which I humbly conceive may be reduced to these Heads, viz.

- 1<sup>o</sup> That the monstrous Absurdities (as your Grace is pleased to term them) which attend the Doctrine

Doctrin of *Transubstantiation* cannot be accounted for, whereas the Difficulties that attend the Doctrin of the blessed *Trinity* may very well be solved. 2<sup>o</sup>. That our Senses, our Sight, Touch, Taste and Smell, declare and inform our Reason, that altho' the Bread and Wine are consecrated, yet they remain still Bread and Wine. 3<sup>o</sup>. That Christ has no other true, real and substantial Body, but that one alone, with which he ascended into Heaven, and that *the Heavens must receive him until the Time of the Resurrection of all Things*. But that according to the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*, says your Grace, *This one Body remaining whole and intire in Heaven, is multiplied into Thousands and Thousands of Distinct and separate Bodies upon the Earth, every one of which is truly, really and substantially the very same with that in Heaven*. 4<sup>o</sup>. That this Doctrin of our's, viz. That Christ's whole and intire Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity, is really, truly, and substantially in the holy Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, as it is manifestly contrary to Sense, Reason, and holy Scripture; was never taught by the Apostles, or believed in the primitive Church. 5<sup>o</sup>. That a learned Jesuit *Costerus* affirms, it is gross *Idolatry* greater than that of the *Gentiles, Egyptians, or Laplanders*, to worship the Host, if Christ's true Body be not contained in it. 6<sup>o</sup>. That the *Infidels* believed God to be present in an Image, as we do Christ in the Host; and directed their Worship to God, as we do to Christ. 7<sup>o</sup>. That the Sacrament is called Bread and Wine after Consecration (which is an Objection of most of the Divines of the Church of *England*) both in the Scripture, and the Writings of the primitive Fathers. These



## Of the Real Presence

These I hope, My Lord, your Grace will allow to be the most material Objections contained in the said *Paragraphs*; and which I believe your Grace knows, to have been answer'd, a hundred Times. However, to give your Grace all the Satisfaction I can, I will briefly consider them. To begin then with the First, viz.

*That the monstrous Absurdities, which attend the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, cannot be accounted for; whereas the Difficulties that attend the Doctrine of the blessed Trinity may very well be solved.*

To this I answer, My Lord; that if we rely upon the Authority of God, who revealed them both; and upon that of his Church, as the Proponent both of the one and the other; we shall be able to Account equally for both; by saying that the same, who bids me believe the *Trinity*, bids me also believe *Transubstantiation*. But if we measure them by the short Line of our own Reason; I am persuaded, there are more insuperable Difficulties attending the Mystery of the *Trinity*, than that of *Transubstantiation*; for the greatest Difficulty in this Point, is that that which appears to our Eyes, to our Touch, to our Taste, to our Smell, to be Bread, is not Bread; but the Body of Christ: And to call in Question, whether Almighty God, to whose omnipotent Power we ascribe this miraculous Effect, and who created both Substance and Accidents or Species, can cloth any Substance, but with the Species or Accidents natural to such Substances, is surely to entertain a mean Opinion of his Omnipotence; since we find so many Instances in Scripture of Angels clothed with the Species or Accidents of

## and Transubstantiation.

123

of Men, of the Holy Ghost, with those of a Dove; and of God the Father, with the Species or Appearance of an old Man: But more especially that of Christ, *Luke*. 24. 39. "Pate & videte, quia Spiritus Carnem & Offa non habet, Sicut videtis me habere." *Handle me and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as you see me have.* Which surely supposes, that Spirits by the Power of God may, and did often take the Accidents or Appearances of Men tho' they were not, in Substance, in Flesh or Bones, Men. There is no such great Difficulty then, or monstrous Absurdities (as you express it) in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, but what may be easily accounted for; by having Recourse to the omnipotent Power of God, who can give such Accidents and Appearances to Bodies, as He thinks fit in his Wisdom. But is it so in the Doctrine of the Myltery of the blessed *Trinity*? Is there any Instance or Example in Nature, that bears any Analogy or Likeness to it? The Father we believe is God, perfect God, eternal God; and really distinct from the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Son is God, perfect God, eternal God, and really distinct from the Father and the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is God, perfect God, eternal God, and really distinct from the Father and the Son: Does it not then appear to our human Reason, that there are three Gods? Yet there is but one God, one divine Nature, and one divine Substance: And why do we believe this to be so, notwithstanding the Opposition of our Reason? 'Tis because God has reveal'd it, and the Catholick Church, which is guided by the Holy Ghost, has declared it to be so; and that the Apostle *St. Paul* bids us,

Cap.

## Of the Real Presence

*Captivate our Understanding in Obedience to Faith.* Is there any Difficulty in Opposition to our Senses, in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as insuperable, as this seems to be to our Reason? No surely. Why shou'd not we then equally believe both; since they are proposed to us upon the same Authority, and draw a Veil over our weak Reason, and fallible, Senses, and adore what we do not Understand? As to what your Grace is pleased to say: *Whether this bold Allegation may not influence some Men to become Socinians, let them consider, who advance it.* I beg leave to answer with another *Quære*: Whether those who charge us with advancing what your Grace calls a bold Allegation, ought not rather to Consider it? And whether those, who in all Ages shook off the Authority of the Church did not open a Gap, not only for the *Socinians*, but also for every other *Sectarie* to deny all such Points of Faith as they did not think to be agreeable to their Reason?

To the Second Head, *viz. That our Senses, our Sight, Touch, Taste and Smell, declare and inform our Reason, that altho' the Bread and the Wine are consecrated, yet they still remain Bread and Wine.* I answer, and say: *First,* We are not to rely upon the Testimony of our Senses, when the Almighty Power interposes. *Secondly,* The Holy Fathers of the Church warn us not to believe our Senses, on this Subject. *St. Ignatius Martyr, and Disciple of Saint John the Evangelist, tells us, that Certain Hereticks did abstain from the Eucharist, and from the publick Service: Because they Confess not the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffer'd for our Sins, and which*  
the



*the Father of his Goodness raised again from the Dead. Epist. ad Smyrn p. 7.* This Holy Bishop and Martyr, did often, no doubt, receive the Holy *Eucharist*; he saw the Appearance of Bread and Wine in it after the Consecration as well as before. His Senses, his Eyes, his Touch, his Smell and Taste did suggest to him, that it was still Bread and Wine; yet he gave no Credit to them: But, upon the Word of his divine Master, believed it to be the Flesh which suffer'd for our Sins; being persuaded that his Word wou'd never fail, and that his own Senses might be deceived. St. *Ignatius* did then believe that Jesus Christ did change the Substance of the Bread and the Wine, into his Flesh and Blood: notwithstanding all that his Senses cou'd suggest to the Contrary. St. *Cyril of Jerusalem* in the Place before cited warns us in more express Terms, not to believe our Senses; he tells us, *Christ changed Water into Wine*, and asks: Why he shou'd not be thought worthy of Belief in changing Wine into his Blood? He tells us moreover, that under the Type or Appearance of Bread, the Body of Christ is given to us, and under the Type of Wine his Blood; and to enforce this Doctrine. He charges us not to Judge of the Matter by our Senses, even by the Sense of tasting. *Judge not* (says he) *of the thing by the Taste; but rather be most certainly assured by Faith, so as to leave no Room for a Doubt, that the Body and the Blood are given to thee* And all this St. *Cyril* preached in his Patriarchal Church of *Jerusalem* about the Year 340. of the Incarnation of Christ; and left this Doctrine upon Record for the Instruction of future Ages. Cou'd any Roman Catholick Divine at present write

## Of the Real Presence

write or speak of *Transubstantiation* (which as your Grace is pleas'd to say, was not known in the primitive Church) in stronger, or plainer Terms?

St. *Ambrose* enforces the same Doctrine, and tells us, we are not to seek or look for the Order of Nature in this Mystery; but to have Recourse to the Omnipotence of God. To persuade us hereof, he Instances, in the Change of *Aaron's* Rod into a Serpent, the Waters of *Nile* into Blood at the Prayer of *Moses*; in the Fire coming down from Heaven, at the Words of *Elias*, in the *Ark* swimming upon the surface of the Water, at the Prayer of *Elizeus*, and concludes from thence, that if the Words of Men were of so much Force as to work such Prodigies, how much more ought we to believe, that the Words of Christ, (who cou'd make of Nothing that which was not) were able to change that which is, into that which it was not. That is, of changing the Bread and the Wine, which are extant on the Altar into his Body and Blood, which were not there before. Where was the Need of all those magnificent Expressions; of all those surprising Instances of God's Power; if the Body and Blood of Christ were only *Typically*, or *Virtually*, or *Symbolically* in the *Eucharist*? Is it to be imagin'd, that that holy and learned Bishop wou'd have recourse to God's Omnipotence to explain this Mystery. If he believed it to remain Bread and Wine after the Consecration. When he might easily have told his Audience: *Here is, beloved of God, a divine Ordinance, the Symbols of the Flesh and Blood of your Saviour Jesus Christ, which will nourish your Souls spiritually, and will to all Intents and*

Pur-

*Purposes convey unto you the Effects of his Passion and Death, being sanctified by the Word of God and our Blessing; as the Water in Baptism bless'd by Prayer and the Word of God, conveys unto you the Merits of his Passion, sanctifies your Souls, and makes you adopted Children of God.* Might not, I say, St. Ambrose, with all the Ease in the World instruct his Flock after this Manner and make them sensible, that as the Water of *Baptism*, which is acknowledg'd to be a pure Element, sanctifies their Souls by the Institution of Christ. So the Bread and the Wine in the *Sacrament*, convey to them the Effects of his Passion and Death, as being his Institution also.

But does St. *Ambrose*, or any of the primitive Fathers reason after the same Manner concerning the *Eucharist*, as they do concerning the Sacrament of *Baptism*? Far from it. They do, indeed, teach and instruct the People in the necessary Preparation for *Baptism*, and tell them, that Elementary Water being bless'd by Prayer and the Word of God, does by Christ's Institution, cleanse them from their Sins, both Original and Actual, when they are washed with, or dipped in it, in the Name of the three Persons of the blessed *Trinity*, provided the Men and Women to be thus baptized make Profession of the Faith of Christ, with true sorrow and Repentance for their Sins, if Persons of Age; or if Children, by their Sureties, bating only Cases of extream necessity. But when they treat of the *Eucharist*, they hold quite another Language. They tell the People, as we find in the ancient *Liturgies*, that all the Powers in Heaven are summon'd to wait upon this great *Mystery*; that the *Angels, Archangels, Thrones and Dominations,*



tions, *Cherubims*, and *Seraphims* come down from Heaven to attend it, cover their Eyes, and Sing *Allelujah*. They set before them the Words of the Institution. **THIS IS MY BODY, &c.** They tell them, that since he had said so, it must be true; that our Senses may be mistaken; but that his Word cannot fail; that therefore we must believe it is his Body; and since there appears no Change in the Species or outward Appearances, the Change must necessarily be in the Substance, And to enforce this Change, they have Recourse to God's Omnipotent Power, to effect the same; and Instance in the most manifest Miracles recorded in the Old Testament to convince them of the Truth thereof; as that of *Aron's Rod* into a Serpent, of the Waters of *Nile* into Blood, of the *Iron* of the *Ax* swimming on the Surface of the Water, and of the Water changed into Wine at the Wedding in *Cana*. Give me leave, then, My Lord, to beg your Grace will give Glory to God, and acknowledge this great Truth, for which you have the warrant of God's Sacred Word, the Authority of the Church from it's very Infancy, the Practice of the Faithful ever since the earliest Ages of Christianity; and all this Recorded by unexceptionable Evidences in the Clearest and strongest Terms that Words can express.

St. *John Chrysostom*, in the Place cited before, holds the very same Language as the rest of the ancient Fathers. He quotes the Words of Christ: **THIS IS MY BODY.** He bids us believe God in all things, and not resist him; Tho' what he says may be repugnant to our Senses, and to our Thoughts; and gives this Reason for it: Because what God does, especially in *Mysteries* of Faith,

Faith, surpasses our Senses and our Reason; and to convince us the more, He adds: *For we cannot be deceived by his Words; but our Senses are easily deceived. Those cannot be false, but these are again and again deceived.*

Thus did the ancient Fathers take a great deal of Pains to reason the People committed to their Care, into a Belief of the *Real Presence* of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, and of the Change of the Bread and Wine into the same, for the great Difficulty Men have naturally to believe any thing that seems to be against their Senses, and above their Reason.

To the Third, viz. *That Christ has no other true real and substantial Body, but that one alone, with which he ascended into Heaven, and that the Heavens must receive him, until the Time of the Restitution of all things. But that according to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation this one Body remaining whole and intire in Heaven is multiplied into Thousands and Thousands of distinct and separate Bodies upon Earth, every one of which is truly really and substantially the very same with that in Heaven.* I answer, and am glad of this Opportunity of agreeing with your Grace, that Christ has but one true Body: But that this Body is, according to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, multiplied into Thousands and Thousands of distinct and separate Bodies, is a Consequence of your Grace's; but not the Doctrine of *Roman Catholicks*: For we hold and believe, that it is the same individual Body of Christ in Heaven, that is in several Places on Earth at the same Time. And if this be a Difficulty, which your Grace cannot digest, I humbly conceive you are as much concerned to solve it, as the *Roman Catholicks*: For in your  
own

own Church Catechism to this Question: *What is the inward Part or thing signified?* The answer is: *The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.* (If then the Body and Blood of Christ, are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful, that is, by the Communicants, in the Lord's Supper. (If one should add truly and substantially or forty other Words more of this Kind, they wou'd add no Force to these, verily and indeed; for truly and verily are synonymous Terms, and indeed and substantially the self same thing.) It being evident that if John, for Instance, be verily and indeed in a Chamber, he is there truly and substantially. If (I say) then the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed, taken and received by the Faithful at the same, or at different Times in different Churches in England and in Ireland, as your Grace will allow they are; The Body and Blood of Christ, must necessarily be in Thousands and Thousands of Places at the same Time. All Antiquity, My Lord, were sensible of your Grace's Difficulty. I may say all good Christians, all the World over. They all believe, that God is one, and has no Parts, that he is all in Heaven, and all in every City, Town and Village on Earth; and consequently in Thousands and Thousands of Places at the same Time, how this can be, they do not comprehend. The same happens in natural Things. A Preacher in a Pulpit speaks to the People, every Man and Woman near him receive into their Ears all that he saith. But if one has all his Words, how can another, a third, or an hundred more have them all? No Body can rightly tell. Is it then any Wonder we shou'd not be able to give



a Reason for the Body of Christ's being in different Places at the same Time; when we cannot account for the like Difficulties in the things we see and hear every Day? How then did the Pastors of the Church instruct the People in the Matter? Why, they refer'd all to the Omnipotent Power of God. They recommended to the People to adore what neither the Pastors nor People cou'd comprehend. Please to hear, My Lord, what the most ancient Liturgy of Saint James says on this Subject: *Taste and see how gracious the Lord is, who is broken and not divided; is given to the Faithful, and not consumed.* What St. John Chrysostom, Lib 3. de Sacerdotio, says: *O the Miracle! O the Benignity of God! He that sits above with the Father, is, at the same Time, in the Hands of all Men, and gives himself to those who are willing to receive and to embrace him: And what your own Brother, Bishop Ken says, as above cited: O God incarnate, how thou canst give us thy Flesh to eat, and thy Blood to drink; how thy Flesh is meat indeed, how thou, who art in Heaven, art present on the Altar, I can by no Means explain, but I firmly believe it all, because thou hast said it; and I firmly rely on thy Love, and on thy Omnipotence, to make good thy Word, tho' the Manner of doing it I cannot comprehend!*

To the 4th. viz. That this Doctrine of ours, viz. That Christ's whole and intire Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity, are really, truly and substantially in the Sacrament; as it is manifestly contrary to Sense, Reason, and holy Scripture, was never taught by the Apostles, or believed in the primitive Church: I answer, and say, that if the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood

## Of the Real Presence

in the *Eucharist* was taught by the Apostles, and believed in the primitive Church; it follows necessarily that whole Christ's Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity, was taught by them, and believed in the primitive Church, to be in the *Eucharist*. For, as it is a Maxim in Divinity, that *Quod semel assumpsit, nunquam dimisit*, so common Sense and Reason tells us, that Christ being true God and true Man, and being no more to die, *Christus non moritur*; Wherever his Body and Blood are, there are also his Soul and Divinity. Now that the Apostles taught, and the primitive Church believed, that Christ's Body and Blood were really in the *Eucharist*; if your Grace will please to look back upon what I have extracted out of the ancient *Liturgies*, and the primitive Fathers upon this Head, I hope you will be satisfied, the Apostles did teach, and the primitive Church did believe, that the Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity of Christ, are really, truly, and substantially in the Sacrament.

To the 5th. viz. *That a learned Jesuit Costerus, affirms it is gross Idolatry, greater than that of the Gentiles, Egyptians or Laplanders to worship the Host, if Christ's true Body be not contained in it.* I answer, and grant Costerus says so: But pray, My Lord, does Costerus say that the true Body of Christ is not contained in the Host? On the contrary, he strenuously asserts it, and brings this Argument to prove *ab Inconvenienti*, that Christ would have dealt unworthily with his Church in giving it Room, by his own Words, to adore a Piece of Bread, *Frustrum Panis*, for 1500 Years, had not his Body been really in the Host. As to the Use your  
Grace

Grace makes of it, I beg leave to refer the Consideration to your Grace's next Paragraph.

To the Sixth, viz. *That the Infidels believed God to be present in an Image; as we do Christ in the Host, and directed their Worship to God, as we do to Christ.* I answer, and beg leave, absolutely to deny this: For the *Infidels* had no Notion of the true God, but gave the worship due to the Creator to the Works of their own Hands, and believed their false God's dwelt in their *Idols*; whereas we believe *Christ* (who is the true and living God) to be in the Host; and this we believe upon God's own Word.

To the last, viz. *That the Sacrament is called Bread and Wine after Consecration (which is an Objection of most of the Divines of the Church of England) both in the Scripture and in the Writings of the primitive Fathers.* I answer, and say, that if this be a good Argument, it will prove more than your Grace desires: That is, it will prove the *R. Catholicks* do not believe the *Real Presence*: For no *Latin* Priest did ever say *Mass* these thousand Years past, who did not call the Host after Consecration, *Bread*. Here are the Words of the Oblation pronounced by the Priest after the Consecration of the Chalice: As your Grace will find in the *Cannon* of our *Missal*: *Offerimus præclaræ Majestati tuæ de tuis Donis & Datis, Hostiam puram, Hostiam sanctam, Hostiam immaculatam, Panem sanctum Vitæ æternæ & Calicem salutis perpetuæ.* In a Word, My Lord, there is nothing more common in Scripture, or in the Language of Mankind, than to call things by the Name of what they were before; or by the Name of that to which they have some Re-



## Of the Real Presence

semblance. Thus Almighty God calls *Moses* a God to *Pharaoh*, *Exod. 7. 1.* For the Resemblance he had to God in Working Miracles and Wonders in the Presence of *Pharaoh* and of his People. And in the same Chapter, the Rod of *Aaron* which was changed into a Serpent, in the very Instant that it was a Serpent, and was swallowing the Rods of the Sorcerers, is called a Rod. For *they* (the Sorcerers) *cast down every Man his Rod, and they became Serpents, but Aaron's Rod swallowed up their Rods. v. 12.* Thus *Daniel* the Prophet, *Cap. 7. 9.* Calls God the Father *Antiquus Dierum*, for his Resemblance in the Vision to an old Man, with white Hair like pure Wooll. Thus *St. John* the Evangelist, *Cap. 2. 9.* Calls the Water that was changed into Wine, Water; even when it was no more Water but Wine, because it was so before: *When the Ruler of the Feast had tasted the Water that was made Wine. saith, St. John.* And thus when a Man walk's in a Gallery or Chamber adorned with Pictures, and pointing with his Finger or Cane at some Pieces, says: *This is King George: This is the Queen.* Yet it never enter'd into any Man's Heart to think it was the real King or Queen he meant. In like Manner; when the Scripture, or the Fathers call the Sacrament *Bread* and *Wine*, they only give them the Names of what they were before; because they still retain their former shape and Appearance. But it is very observable, that neither the Scripture, nor the Fathers do call the Sacrament *Bread*, *simpliciter & sine addito* (to use a School Phrase) but with some Addition; as: *This Bread, The Bread that I will give, the Bread of Life, the holy Bread,*  
&c.

Exc. And the same may be said of the Wine, *Ceteris paribus*.

In the 27th. Paragraph, your Grace saith, that supposing the Doctrine of Transubstantiation to be in the general true; altho', adds your Grace, we may as well suppose white to be black, and black to be white; yet if it may in some particular Cases fail, it is manifest, that in worshipping the Host you still remain under a great Hazard of the Sin of Idolatry. For if at any Time, (continues your Grace) when the Prayer of Consecration is said, no Transubstantiation follows, your Worship, as Colsterus well observes, is given to a Piece of Bread. Now if the Person (continues your Grace) who says Mass be not an Ordained Priest; if he has not a sufficient Intention, to do what the Church intends should be done; if the Wafer or Bread which he pretends to consecrate be not made of Wheat, with many other Defects occutring in the Celebration of Mass, which your Grace has extracted out of the Roman Missal; there is no Transubstantiation, and consequently danger of Idolatry in worshipping the Host. For which Reason, your Grace sincerely declares that, if you were of our Religion, you do not see how you could dare give the Worship, which we are taught to do, to the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist; except your Grace had been by, at the Ordination of the Priest who says Mass, and were sure that the Person who ordained him were truly a Bishop, and that nothing necessary to such an Ordination was omitted; and also except you had stood by and seen the Wheat Ground, and the Wine press'd out of the Grapes, and had kept them both in your own Possession

until you had seen the Wafer made, and had with your own Hand deliver'd both it and the Wine to the Priest at the Altar, so that you your self might be sure that no Change cou'd possibly be made of either of them, and moreover except you understood the *Latin* Tongue, and had heard the Priest rightly pronounce the Words of Consecration. For, continues your Grace, when *Mass* is said, if the Bread and Wine are not transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ, it is gross *Idolatry*, to give divine Worship to them; and this same *Transubstantiation*, adds your Grace, depends upon so many other concurring Things, that you should not know how it were possible for you to be sufficiently sure of it, except you had the Testimony of your own Eyes and Ears that every one of these Things, were with the greatest Exactness observed and done.

This is, My Lord, the Substance, and mostly in your Grace's own Words, of the Paragraph under Consideration. All which, I think, may be reduced to two Heads, viz. First, *Whether the People, who hear Mass are guilty of Idolatry in worshipping the Host, when they cannot be sure, but that some of the above-said Defects occur?* Secondly, *Whether the Apprehension of a Failure in any of those Things required for the Bread and Wine, and the Intention of the Priest be a sufficient Reason, not to worship the Host except the Precautions mentioned by your Grace be taken?*

To the first, I answer in the Negative, and maintain that the People are not guilty of gross or sinful *Idolatry*, in Case it should happen, that any one, or more of the aforesaid Defects occurred:



erred ; and that at most it is but material *Idolatry* ; which very often is no Sin at all, as in this Case. For how is it consistent with God's Goodness and Love for Mankind, or with right Reason to Judge Men Guilty of Damnable Sin, for performing an Act, by which they sincerely intend the Worship only of Jesus Christ their Lord and Master ; and when it is morally impossible for them to discover any of the Defects which might hinder his being really and substantially present in the Sacrament ? If *Zacheus* who, as it is very likely, heard only Christ's Voice, but cou'd not see (for the Croud) much more than his Face, when he bad him come down out of the *Sycamore Tree* ; shou'd, by a Mistake, adore, another Man of the Multitude, thinking him to be Christ, for the likeness he had to what he could discover of him. Does your Grace, I say, think *Zacheus* wou'd be guilty of gross or sinful *Idolatry*, when his sincere Intention was to worship Jesus Christ ? Or that the Holy Apostle and Evangelist St. *John*, was guilty of gross or sinful *Idolatry*, when he worshiped the Angel, but thought that he was God ? Surely your Grace wou'd not entertain such Thoughts either of the one or the other. In like Manner, if by any Chance it should happen, that any of these Defects mentioned by your Grace shou'd take place at any Time, and that the People shou'd worship the Host, which they sincerely believe to be the true and real Body of Christ when duely consecrated, and that their Belief thereof is founded in the best Authority human Nature is able to receive ; Is it to be imagin'd Almighty God the great Lover of Man, shou'd judge them guilty of *Idolatry*, the most abominable

nable of Sins, when their sincere and hearty Intention is to worship Christ alone, and when at the same Time, they are under a moral Impossibility of discovering the Defect? On the contrary they wou'd grievously Sin, as St. *Augustin* teaches in a Passage before cited, if they shou'd not adore it, when they have no sufficient Reason to doubt of the Validity of the Consecration. Besides, I hope your Grace will allow that the Sacrament is duely consecrated ten thousand Times, for once any such defect happens. Is it not therefore, My Lord, more reasonable the People shou'd always adore the Sacrament, seeing they are commanded to adore it when consecrated, than not adore it at all, for fear of adoring it, when not duely consecrated; and when they are sure God will have a Regard to their pious Intention, as being under a moral Impossibility of discovering the Defect?

As to what your Grace produces out of the Jesuit *Costerus*, whom you call a learned Man, and whose Opinion will therefore I hope be of the greater Authority with your Grace, (in my humble Opinion) it proves invincibly our Doctrine. For he brings the Words cited by your Grace, as a tenth Proof of the *Real Presence* and *Transubstantiation* in the *Eucharist*, and forms an Argument *ab Inconvenienti*, proving that if Christ's real Body and Blood were not contained in the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*; the Church would have been guilty of gross *Idolatry*, occasion'd by Christ's own Words, for the space of 1500. Years; but, in his Opinion such Behaviour was unworthy of our Saviour *Jesus Christ* towards his beloved Spouse, for which he shed his precious Blood; and therefore concludes

cludes that his real Body and Blood are contained in the Sacrament: *Costerus* his Argument runs *pari Passu* with this: It was gross *Idolatry* in the Apostles, and has continued to be so in the Church for the space of 1500 Years, greater than that of the *Gentiles, Egyptians, or Laplanders* to adore or pay divine Worship to Jesus Christ, if he be not the true and living God. But the Apostles and the C. Church did, for the space of 1500 Years, adore Jesus Christ. *Ergo, &c.* Pray, My Lord, would it not be unreasonable in this Case to say, that *Costerus* charges the Apostles and the Church with gross *Idolatry*? And as this would be a good Argument against those, who deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ: the Apostles and the Church believing him to be God upon the Strength of Incontestable Miracles, which can only be wrought by an Omnipotent Power, and that for the Testimony of Truth only. This I say, would therefore be a good Argument against those who deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ, otherwise God himself would be the Cause of their *Idolatry*. Even so *Costerus* his Argument for the *Real Presence* and *Transubstantiation* holds good: Otherwise Christ himself must be charged with the pretended *Idolatry* of the *Roman Catholics*, believing the *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, upon his own Express Words: **THIS IS MY BODY, THIS IS MY BLOOD.** And as it is inconsistent with God's infinite Goodness to work a Miracle in Favour of a Lie, or for the Establishment of a Falshood; so it is repugnant to his Infinite Veracity to tell a Lie, or not to fulfil his Promises.



*Of the Real Presence*

But if after all this, My Lord, I shou'd grant, that *Costerus* was of your Grace's Opinion (which I can by no Means do) He is but one, and makes so inconsiderable a Figure in the Catalogue of our learned Writers whether ancient or modern (not to speak of the Belief and Practice of the Faithful all over the *East* and *West*, from the earliest Ages of Christianity) that it wou'd give me no great Pain, otherwise than upon Account of his Soul: And I humbly conceive, when your Grace made use of his Authority, such as it is, you did not at that Time, call to Mind that many great and learned Writers of the Church of *England* are, to a degree of Evidence, much more of our Opinion than they are of your Grace's upon the Point of the *Real Presence* in the Sacrament.

To the Second, viz. Whether the Apprehension of a Failure in any of those Things required for the Bread and Wine, and the Intention of the Priest be a sufficient Reason not to worship the Host, except the Precautions mentioned by your Grace, be taken. I answer, *First*, that it is no Reason at all; because a moral Assurance is the most we can reasonably expect not only in this, but also in every other weighty Affair of human Life. A Man takes a great deal of Labour, and Toil to purchase an Estate, and leaves it to a Son, of whom he has no other Assurance, that he is his own, but the Confidence he has in the Virtue of his Wife. Another gives his Banquier 5000 Pounds upon his Bill, upon the moral Assurance he has of his being able to pay him, when he calls for his Money; a third purchases a Town Land, pays down his Money before he takes or gets Possession

sion of it, upon the moral Assurance he has that the Man he deals with is honest, and will not fail in what he promises. Secondly, That other Sacraments and divine Ordinances are Subject to the like Defects, as to their Validity, and yet a moral Assurance of their being duely perform'd is all that any rational Man requires. A Child is Baptized. He grows up to Man's Estate, is ordained Deacon, Priest and Bishop. Neither he, nor his Parents have any other but a moral Assurance, that it was with Elementary, and not with some kind of those Waters, which Gentlewomen usally distil in their Houses that he was Baptized; and I am sure there is much more Danger of it's being so perform'd, than of a Priest making Use of *Rice-flower Bread*, or *Vinegar* in the *Mass*; because the Taste in these, is always consulted, and wou'd soon discover the Mistake; but in those it is not. And if it shou'd happen, that any thing essential to the Sacrament of *Baptism* be wanting, either in the Matter or Form, by the Use of those distilled Waters, or by any other Defect, the Man is not Baptized, nor consequently, Deacon, Priest, or Bishop; neither are those, whom he might happen to ordain, Deacons, Priests, or Bishops; yet we see no Scruple made in believing Men to be truly Baptized, and truly ordained. In like Manner, we need not Scruple that the Priest, who says *Mass*, does duely consecrate with the right Matter and Form, but may safely rely upon his Integrity; and consequently worship the Host without any Danger of *Idolatry*. It is, indeed requisite that all the Care and Caution human Prudence can suggest, shou'd be taken both in *Baptism*, *Ordination*, and in celebrating *Mass*;  
And

and it's for this Reason, the Defects, your Grace Mentions, are prefixed to our *Missals*; to the End they may be avoided, or redress'd, in Case the Priest, or any other concerned in the things pertaining to the Altar, shou'd, thro' human Frailty or neglect, commit Mistakes. But that Men shou'd be always in Apprehension concerning the Validity of their *Baptism*, or their Ordination, or that they wou'd not worship *Jesus Christ* in the *Eucharist*, for fear of committing *Idolatry*; *Except they had been by* (as your Grace says) *at the Ordination of the Priest, who says Mass, and were sure that the Person who ordained him were truly a Bishop, and that nothing Necessary to such an Ordination was omitted; and also except they had stood by and seen the Wheat ground, and the Wine pressed out of the Grapes, and had kept them both in their Possession until they had seen the Wafer made, and had with their own Hands deliver'd both it and the Wine to the Priest at the Altar;* is in my humble Opinion, no way requisite, and, in many Cases, impossible to be practiced. And seeing your Grace wou'd put a *Roman Catholick* under so many hard and insuperable Difficulties, in order to be certain of the Validity of Consecration, for fear of committing the pretended *Idolatry*; I cannot help thinking, your Grace must needs be in the most uneasy Scituation imaginable, for want of those Certainties and Evidences (which you cannot possibly have) of your own *Baptism*, without which there is no *Ordination*, no not *Salvation* for any.



CHAP. VIII.

Of Communion in one Kind.

YOur Grace's 28th. Paragraph begins thus:  
 " I have thus long infilted upon the Absur-  
 " dities of *Transubstantiation* and it's Confe-  
 " quences; because they appear to me to be so  
 " very gross, that if you will but seriously and  
 " impartially consider them, it cannot but bring  
 " you to a sight of your Errors. I will but  
 " mention three or four more of those Additi-  
 " ons, which Pope *Pius* has made to the Catho-  
 " lick Faith, and leave you, between God and  
 " your own Consciences to consider of them.  
 " Did then the Apollles every where teach the  
 " Christian Church, under Pain of Damnation  
 " to believe, that under one Kind only, whole  
 " and intire Christ, and a true Sacrament is  
 " taken and received? Is it not most notorious  
 " that Jesus Christ himself instituted this blessed  
 " Sacrament under both Kinds, and command-  
 " ed his Disciples to *drink* of the *Cup*, as well  
 " as to *eat* of the *Bread*, which he gave them?  
 " Is it not confess'd by the most learned of your  
 " own Communion (and denied by none that I  
 " know of) that, in Pursuance of this Instituti-  
 " on of Christ the whole Church every where,  
 " for above a Thousand Years, gave the Sacra-  
 " ment in both Kinds to all the People? And  
 " does not St. *Paul* in the most expresse Terms,  
 " require that every one should so receive it? *Let*  
 " *a Man examin himself*, (says he) *and so let him*  
 " *eat of the Bread, and Drink of the Cup: 1.*  
 " Cor.

## Of Communion in one Kind.

" Cor. 11. 28. Was it ever establish'd as a  
 " Law even in the Church of *Rome*, that the  
 " People should receive under one Kind only,  
 " until the Council of *Constance*, in the Year,  
 " 1415, so decreed? And that (as they them-  
 " selves express it) *in direct Opposition to Christ's*  
 " *own Institution*? Their Words are, *Licet*  
 " *Christus post Cenam instituerit, & suis Disci-*  
 " *pulis administraverit, sub utraque Specie Pa-*  
 " *nis & Vini, hoc venerabile Sacramentum: ta-*  
 " *men hoc non obstante, &c. Conc. Const. Sess. 13.*  
 " Certainly to receive a true Sacrament, is to  
 " receive all that Christ has therein instituted or  
 " appointed to be received: For if any thing,  
 " which Christ has so instituted, be wilfully omit-  
 " ted, it cannot be a true Sacrament, but must be  
 " either none at all, or at best but a defective or  
 " imperfect one; and yet the Council of *Trent*,  
 " in the same Breath (*Sess. 21. Cap. 3.*) owns that  
 " Christ instituted this Sacrament and deliver'd  
 " it to the Apostles in both Kinds, and at the  
 " very same Time, declares that the true Sacra-  
 " ment is received under one Kind, (which is  
 " now become a Part of that Catholick Faith,  
 " without which (according to Pope *Pius*) no  
 " Man can be sav'd."

Had your Grace been pleas'd in the Beginning  
 of this Paragraph, to change your Style a little,  
 and say: *I have thus long insisted upon the Diffi-*  
*culties attending Transubstantiation.* I should  
 have readily agreed with your Grace. Diffi-  
 culties there are, indeed, insuperable by human  
 Comprehension attending *Transubstantiation*,  
 and the Mytery of the *Trinity*; but greater at-  
 tending the latter, than the former; for which  
 we cannot otherwise account, than by adoring  
 what

what we cannot comprehend, as I had the Honour to tell your Grace before out of the primitive Fathers, and a learned Bishop of the Church of *England*. But that there shou'd be any Absurdities in what my Redeemer said, or did, I will not, I cannot say.

Your Grace proceeds ; and a few Lines after, asks this Question: *Did then the Apostles every where teach the Christian Church, under Pain of Damnation, to believe that under one Kind only, whole and intire Christ, and a true Sacrament is taken and received?* With humble Submission, My Lord, I think the proper Question (in this Debate between your Grace and us) shou'd be this: *Did not the Apostles every where teach the Christian Church, that it was essentially necessary to receive the Sacrament in both Kinds?* For if so: Then to take it in one Kind is to take no Sacrament at all (as your Grace observes) since the Essence of any Thing is indivisible. Take away an essential Part, and you destroy the whole. Take away the Soul from the Body, the Man is no more. If then to take in both Kinds be of the Essence of the Sacrament, and that it is essentially necessary to drink the Blood, as well as it is to eat the Body of Christ in the Communion, it will necessarily follow that the Sacrament was always, in the true Church of Christ received in both Kinds by both Clergy and Laity, not only for a thousand Years, as your Grace says, but also from the beginning to this Day; and that if, by any Chance, it had happened to be taken in one Kind, the Church must have looked upon it as a great Abuse, and have condemned it as such. But, the quite contrary appears by the best Monuments we have of the Practice



## Of Communion in one Kind.

and Doctrine of the primitive Church, which tells us, that the Sacrament was given to Infants and little Children under the Species of *Wine*; to the Sick, under that of *Bread*; to the *Solitaries* or *Hermits*, to Travellers for their spiritual Comfort in any Necessity or Danger, and to the People to take at home in their Houses under the same Kind.

Your Grace says, *It is confessed by the most learned of our Communion, (and denied by none that you know of) that the whole Church every where, for above a Thousand Years gave the Sacrament in both Kinds to all the People.* Your Grace then, did not read the Bishop of *Meaux's* *Treatise* upon this Subject, nor *Belarmine*, nor *Peron*, nor an hundred other *Contravertists*, who all affirm what I here advance. Nay the Words of Christ plainly evince it. *If any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever, and the Bread that I will give is my Flesh* (to use your own Version) *which I will give for the Life of the World.* Joh. 6. 51. says Christ. If then by eating that Bread which is his *Flesh*, I shall live for ever; do not I receive all that I want? What can I expect, by eating and drinking the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ more than to live for ever, which Christ tells me I shall attain to, by eating only of the Bread, which is his *Flesh*? In a Word, Christ promises the same Blessing, the same Reward, *viz.* The Life everlasting to those who receive his Body under one, as well as under both Kinds. St. Paul, 1. Cor. Cap. 11. 27. confirms this Doctrine; his Words are: *Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread, or drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* From this Passage

sage of St. Paul, two Things are evidently plain: The *First*, that to take of either Kind, namely, under the Species of Bread to some, and under the Species of Wine to others, was sufficient in order to eternal Salvation. The *Second*, that the Body and Blood of Christ are really contained under either Kind, that is, either under the Species of Bread, or under the Species of Wine, since St. Paul affirms, that whosoever takes either Kind unworthily shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which surely he could not be, by taking the Body only, if the Blood of Christ was not there also.

Your Grace will tell me it is in the English Bibles with the Copulative *and*, and not with the Disjunctive *or*. *Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, &c.* I know, My Lord, it is so, but, I cannot help it. But this I know also, that this Translation is contrary to all the Manuscripts, and ancient printed Texts, of Saint Paul, whether in *Greek* or *Latin*, that ever I cou'd find; and I do assure your Grace, I did search many, and had an Opportunity of consulting some of the best Libraries in *Europe*. They are render'd with the Disjunctive *vel* in all the ancient Manuscripts and printed Copies of the *Latin Vulgar*, which I cou'd meet with, and which cannot be suspected of any Design, as being made long before our Disputes arose; they are so in all the *French* Translations even those of *Geneva*, that ever I read: *Quiconque mangera de ce Pain ou boira de cette Coup.* They are so in the *Latin Bible* of *Exemellius* and *Juanius* printed in *London* 1661. *Quisquis ederit*

*Panem hunc, vel biberit Poculum Domini*: In a Word, I believe there is not a Manuscript, or printed Bible extant, except your *English*, and those made from it, that has the Copulative *and* in this Verse of St. Paul.

Perhaps your Grace may tell me again, that the Copulative *et*, *and*, is often in the Bible taken for the Disjunctive *et*, *or*; I grant it is, My Lord; But I am pretty sure your Grace will never find in any other Translation of the new Testament, except your own, that ever this Disjunctive *et*, *or*, was taken for the Copulative *et*, *and*; or that any other Interpreter had render'd it so. Whence I conclude from the Words of Christ, and St. Paul, that neither Christ intended, nor St. Paul ever taught, it shou'd be essential or necessary, for the worthy Participation of the Sacrament, to take it in both Kinds; and that the giving it in one or both, is but a Point of Discipline left by Christ to the Discretion of the Church; as the Exigencies of Time, Place and Persons shall require: For besides the many Prophanations that attended the giving the Cup, as the spilling and treading under Foot the *precious Blood* of our Redeemer (which cou'd not be seen without Horror) when the first Fervour of Christianity abated, and Multitudes came crouding to receive it. The all seeing God, *qui attingit a Fine ad Finem fortiter, & omnia disponit suaviter*, foresaw it was naturally impossible for all Christians and in all Countries, to take the Sacrament in both Kinds. How many Countries are there in the World where no Wine grows? How many remote and barbarous Nations have received the Faith, and have Millions of Christi-  
ans



ans among them, who have little or no Wine at all? How many abstemious Christians are there in the World, who cannot bear the Taste or Smell of Wine? And to go no further, for an Instance of all this, than the *Northern* Parts of our own Country. How many of their Priests, to my certain Knowledge, are so poor, that many of them do scarce receive as much Money in a Year, from their Parishioners, as wou'd purchase Wine enough to communicate their People, under the Species of Wine only, even at *Easter*?

And must none of all these receive the Sacrament in one Kind, because they cannot receive it in both? No doubt they ought not, if the taking it in both Kinds be of the Essence of the *Sacrament*. What will become then, of the People of the primitive Church, of the *Solataries* or *Hermits*, who frequently or rather daily took it under the Species of Bread alone? Of the People who took it at Home in their Houses, of the sick who took it likewise under the same Species? Or of the Children, who took it under the Species of Wine? Or rather what shall we say of the primitive Holy Fathers and Pastors of the Church, who not only saw and knew, but also approved of this Practice? *St. Cyprian, Lib. de Lapsis*, gives three Instances of this Practice of the first of which, he was an Eye witness himself. The *first* of a little Girl at the Breast. The *second* of a certain Woman who had at Home in her House the Blessed *Sacrament*, under the Species of Bread, laid it up in a Box or Chest. And the *third* of a Man, who attempted to carry home the *Sacrament* under the Species of Bread, between both

his Hands, as the Christians were accustomed to do, and to take every Day at Home in Order to strengthen themselves against the Violence of the Persecutions which they hourly expected. Let us hear his own Words : “ Presene ac  
 “ Telle me ipso accipite quid euenit. Paren-  
 “ tes fortè fugientes, dum trepidi minùs sibi con-  
 “ sulunt, sub Nutricis Alimento parvulam Fili-  
 “ am reliquerunt. Relictam Nutrix detulit ad  
 “ Magistratus. Illi ei apud *Idolum*, quo Popu-  
 “ lus confluebat, quod Carnem nec dum posset  
 “ edere per Ætatem, Panem Mero mixtum,  
 “ quod tamen & ipsum de Immolatione pereun-  
 “ tium supererat, tradiderunt. Recepit Filiam  
 “ postmodum Mater. Sed Facinus Puella com-  
 “ missam tam loqui & indicare non potuit, quam  
 “ nec intelligere prius potuit, nec arcere. Ig-  
 “ noratione igitur obreptum est, ut Sacrificanti-  
 “ bus nobis eam secum Mater inferret. Sed e-  
 “ nim Puella mixta cum Sanctis, Precis nostræ &  
 “ Orationis impatiens ; nunc Ploratu concuti,  
 “ nunc Mentis Æstu caput fluctuabunda jactari,  
 “ & velut Tortore cogente, quibus poterat In-  
 “ dicijs Conscientiam facti in simplicibus adhuc  
 “ Annis rudis Anima fatebatur. Ubi vero so-  
 “ lenibus adimpleris Calicem Diaconus offerre  
 “ Præsentibus caput, & accipientibus Cæteris  
 “ Locus ejus advenit, Faciem suam Parvula in-  
 “ stinctu divinæ Majestatis avertere, Os Labijs  
 “ obturantibus premere, Calicem recusare. Per-  
 “ sistit tamen Diaconus, & reluctanti licet, de  
 “ Sacramento Calicis infudit. Tunc sequitur  
 “ singultus & Vomitus. In Corpore ac Ore vio-  
 “ lato *Eucharistia* permanere non potuit. Sancti-  
 “ ficatus in Domini Sanguine Potus de pollutis  
 “ Visceribus erupit. Tanta est Potestas Domini,  
 “ tanta

" tanta Majestas ! " Hear what happened, I myself being present and Witness thereof. A certain Father and Mother flying from Persecution, whilst in their Fear they did not take sufficient Care, left to be Suckled by a Nurse their little Daughter, of whom the Nurse informed the Magistrates : These gave the Child, at the Idol, whither the People gather'd together, Bread steeped in Wine because she could not eat flesh for her Age, which Bread remained of what was offered in Sacrifice by those who perish. The Mother afterward receives her Daughter, but the Child could neither tell the Crime she committed, nor understand it, nor hinder it. It happened therefore ignorantly, that as we were offering the Sacrifice, her Mother brought her in with herself. But the Girl mixt with the Saints, not being able to bear our Prayers, began now to tremble and cry : again to move and swell up, and, as if she had been compelled by an Executioner ; her Ignorant Soul in so tender Years confess'd the Fact, with such Marks as she was able to give thereof. But when the Solemnity was over, the Deacon began to present the Chalice to such as were by ; and when they had received, and it came to her turn, the little one turned aside her Face, by the Instinct of the divine Majesty, closed her Mouth with her Lips, and refused the Chalice. The Deacon however persisted, and notwithstanding her Resistance poured down her Throat some of the Sacrament of the Chalice. Immediately followed sobbing and heaving. The Eucharist cou'd not remain in a polluted Body and Mouth. The Drink sanctified in the Blood of the Lord, came up out of her polluted Bowels, so great is the Power of the Lord, so great his Majesty !



## Of Communion in one Kind,

“ Et cum Quædam (*continues St. Cyprian*) Arcam suam, in qua Domini Sanctum fuit, Manibus indignis tentasset apperire, Igne inde surgente de territa est, nè auderet attingere.”

*And when a certain Woman had attempted with polluted Hands, to open her Chest, in which the holy one of the Lord was laid, she was so frightened by a Fire flaming out from thence, that she durst not touch it.*

“ Et alius (*adds he*) qui & ipse maculatus; Sacrificio à Sacerdote celebrato, Partem cum cæteris ausus est latentè accipere: Sanctum Domini edere, & contrectare non potuit: Cinerem ferre se appetitis Manibus invenit.”

*And another, who was also polluted; when the Priest had celebrated the Sacrifice, presumed to take privily a Piece with the rest; he could not eat or touch the holy one of the Lord; he found, when he had opened his Hands, that he carried Ashes.*

Here your Grace may please to observe, that St. Cyprian was so far from condemning the Practice of giving the Sacrament in one Kind; to little Children under the Species of Wine; to Men and Women under the Species of Bread to be carry'd to their Houses for their daily spiritual Refection, and in order to strengthen themselves in Time of Persecution, that he only declaims against those, who had presumed to receive it with polluted Hearts or Hands. But wou'd not he (think you My Lord) cry aloud against the Practice itself, had he believed, that it was essential to the Worthy Participation of the Sacrament to take it in both Kinds? For my Part, My Lord, I shou'd be apt to believe it was not, had I no other Evidence of the

Maty

Matter, than that of a Man of St. Cyprian's Antiquity, Learning and Piety. But that your Grace may see this Practice was not peculiar to the Churches of *Affrica*, of which St. Cyprian was the chief Bishop in his own Days; I shall furnish your Grace with Examples, of the like Practice, both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches.

*Eusebius Casariensis* the famous Ecclesiastical Historian, *Lib. 6. Cap. 36.* relates a Passage to the same Purpose, which he copied from a Letter wrote by *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria* to a certain *Fabius*, who favoured the Schism of *Novatus*. Here are *Dionysius* his Words, made English from the *Greek*: *There dwelt with us a certain faithful Old Man, whose Name was Serapion: Who altho' he had passed a great Part of his Life with Integrity and blameless, yet in Time of Persecution fell through Infirmary of Mind. This Man very often earnestly desired to be again received into the Church: But no Man, because he had sacrificed to the Idols, gave Ear to his Petition. Having fallen into a Fit of Sickness, he continued three Days without Speech or Sense. On the fourth Day being a little eased, he called his Nephew unto him, and said: How long will ye detain me O Son? Hasten I pray, and dismiss me soon. Call unto me one of the Priests. When he had spoke these Words, he lost his Speech again. The Boy ran for the Priest. It was then Night; the Priest himself was sick, and could not come to him: But because I had order'd, that such as were upon the Point of Departing this Life, shou'd be made Partakers of the holy Mysteries (provided they had called for them, and especially if before, whilst they were in perfect Health, they had humbly desired them) That so be-*  
ing

ing dismissed with good Hope they might depart this Life. The Priest gave the Boy a small Particle of the Eucharist, commanded him to moisten it, and to put it in the Mouth of the old Man. The Boy went homewards, and when he was not far off, before he could enter into the House with what he carried. Serapion spoke again and said, Son thou art come; the Priest it seems could not come, but do thou quickly what thou art order'd, and dismiss me. The Boy moistened the Eucharist, and gave it into his Mouth, which he having swallowed, immediately gave up the Ghost.

Tertullian long before either St. Cyprian or Dionysius were born, approved of this Practice, and gives an evident Testimony of it. *Lib. de Orat. Cap. 14.* His own Words are: "Simili-  
 " ter de Stationum Diebus, non putant plerique  
 " Sacrificiorum Orationibus interveniendum,  
 " quod Statio solvenda sit accepto Corpore Do-  
 " mini, ergo Devotum Deo Obsequium Eu-  
 " charistia resolvit, an majus Deo obligat? Non-  
 " ne solemnior erit Statio tua si & ad Aram Dei  
 " steteris? Accepto Corpore Domini & reser-  
 " vato utrumque salvum est, & Participatio Sa-  
 " crificij, & Executio Officij." In like Manner concerning the Days of Station (Fasting Days) there are some who do not think they are obliged to assist at the Prayers of the Sacrifices, because the Station is over, when they receive the Body of the Lord. Does therefore the Eucharist dissolve our pious Obedience to God, or does it not rather tie us to him? Is not your Station the more Solemn if you stand even at the Altar? When you receive the Body of the Lord, and reserve it,

both



both are perfected, as well the Participation of the Sacrifice, and the Discharge of your Duty.

And again, *Lib. 2. ad Uxor. Cap. 5.* "Non sciet Maritus quid secretò ante omnem Cibum Gultes? Et si sciverit, Panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur"? *Will not your Husband know what you secretly taste before all Food? And if he should know it, will not he believe it to be Bread, not that which it is called?* The Christians then, and even the Women did reserve the Eucharist under the Species of Bread, and brought it home to their Houses, in order to receive it constantly before any other Food, for their spiritual Refection.

The Manner of *St. Ambrose* his receiving the Sacrament under the Species of Bread, which must needs, by the Circumstances, be reserved either in the House, or in the Church near the House, is no less evident, but much more remarkable, *Paulinus in Vita Sti. Ambros.* tells us, that *St. Honoratus* Bishop of *Vercelles*, who came to visit *St. Ambrose* in his Death Bed, was in the dead Time of the Night, call'd upon, by a Voice from Heaven, which said to him thrice: *Arise, delay not, he is departing*; that *Honoratus* came down, and gave him the Body of the Lord; and that as soon as he had received it, he expired. Is it then to be imagined, that if *Jesus Christ* did institute the Sacrament under both Kinds so as that the taking of both, shou'd be essentially necessary, the heavenly Voice which warned *St. Honoratus* to go down, wou'd not warn him a little sooner, that he might have Time to give him the Sacrament under both Kinds? But neither *St. Honoratus*, nor any other Bishop or Pastor of the Church, ever found

found fault with the Communion of St. *Ambrose*, nor condemned it as contrary to Christ's Institution; which yet they wou'd not fail to do, had they believed it was essentially necessary for the worthy Participation of the Sacrament to take it in both Kinds. The same Practice is further confirmed by the Conduct of *Satyrus*, St. *Ambrose* his elder Brother. This Man (as St. *Ambrose* himself, *Lib. de Obiit. Frat. Satyr.* tells us) being in a violent Storm at Sea, in which all on Board despair'd of Life, and seeing the Christians preparing themselves for Death by receiving the sacred Body of Christ, which they carried about them, begged one of them to give him a Particle of it, and for as much as he was not at this Time Baptized, but was only a *Catechumen*, he wrapped it up in a Handkerchief, put it about his Neck, and Cast himself into the Sea; and by the Mercy of God, he and all the Christian Passengers came safe to Shore, tho' the Ship was wrecked to Pieces,

It wou'd be tedious to Instance in all the Facts of this Nature recorded in History, and in the Works of the Fathers. To say nothing then of the Discipline of the *Oriental*s, whether *Orthodox* or *Hereticks*, who, as appears by their ancient and modern *Rituals*, gave in all Ages the Sacrament, for the most part under the Species of Bread to the Sick, and to the Children at the Breast under that of the Wine, of which many Instances, are to be seen in the 4th. *Tome* of *Monsieur Renaudot's Perpetuity of the Faith*: I shall conclude with this Argument: Either Christ commanded the joint Administration of the Sacrament under both Kinds, or he did not. If he did, then they cou'd never have been parted,

parted, even in private Communions, without Sacrilege; then were *Tertulian*, *St. Cyprian*, *St. Dyonysius of Alexandria*, *St. Basil*, and (to say nothing of the rest of the *Latin Fathers* and *Pastors*) all the *Oriental*s whether *Hereticks* or *Orthodox Pastors*, who both by Word and Deed, approved of, and countenanced this Practice, guilty of Sacrilege. If he did not, then it is Matter of Discipline only, and consequently, the Church may give it in both, or in one Kind, as the Exigencies of Time, Place and Persons require.

Christ did, indeed institute both Kinds, and did Command all the Apostles, and none were then present but the Apostles, to drink as well as to eat. But then his Design was to offer a Sacrifice, as well as to institute a Sacrament, and for as much as he intended to make them Priests, and vest them with the Power of offering the same Sacrifice, and that a Sacrifice is not fully compleated till it is consumed; he commanded them to take both Kinds to that Purpose; and that they might moreover clearly and plainly see what they were to do, when he made them Priests, and said: Do this, *Hoc facite*, that is, do what you see me do now, as I am offering my self to my Heavenly Father for the Remission of Sins, and am eating my Body, and drinking my Blood. Or as *St. Jerom* Words it, *Ipse Conviva & Convivium, ipse comedens, & qui comeditur*. So do ye personate me, Offer up my Body and Blood, mystically separated from one another, under the Types of Bread and Wine, by virtue of my Words, which are Spirit and Life, and compleat the Sacrifice by taking both Kinds as you see me do. But that he  
com-



commanded all Christians to take the Sacrament in both Kinds, is no where to be seen, either in the Scripture, or in the Works of the ancient Fathers. On the contrary, as it has been the Belief of the Catholick Church from the Beginning, that whole and intire Christ's Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity are contained under either Kind; and as in the Law of *Moses* the People, who offer'd their Sacrifices by the Hands of the Priests of the *Levitical* Order, were Partakers of the Benefit of the Sacrifice; when they eat of any Part of it; or as those who gathered the *Manna*, had all the same Quantity; tho' some gathered more, some less. as the Law says, and as *St. Paul* affirms, "*Qui multum non abundavit, & qui modicum non minoravit.*" He that gather'd much, had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no Lack. *1 Cor. 8. 15.* So those who received the *Eucharist* in both Kinds, (of which this *Manna* and these Sacrifices were Types and Figures) received no more than such as receive it in one Kind only. Of this we have a further corroborative Proof from the Words of *St. Theodorus Studita*, a famous *Grecian* Father of the ninth Century, and a Man very much celebrated for his extraordinary Piety and Learning; who says, *Lib. 2. Epist. 129.* That the Communion under one or both Species for the Laity, was indeed a Matter of Indifferency; because no less was received under one, than under both Species. Nor is it to be doubted that this is, and always was the Opinion of the *Greek Church*, for these two Reasons. 1<sup>o</sup>. Because they never did assign the giving of the Sacrament in one Kind to the Laity, as a Cause in part for their Breach of Communion

munion with, or *Schism*, from the *Latin Church*, as may be seen by the Acts of the Council of *Florence*, and all the Defences they ever drew up in their own Justification; tho' they do, and did, ever since the Days of *Photius* their *Prothoschismaticus*, reproach them with consecrating in unleavened Bread, with the Addition of the Word *Filioque* to the Creed, &c. 2<sup>o</sup>. Because they themselves always gave, generally speaking, the Sacrament to the Sick in Bed under the Species of Bread alone, and in latter Ages never otherwise, as appears by their *Rituals* and publick Office Books. 'Tis true, these modern *Rituals* direct, that the sacred Host, reserved to communicate the Sick, shou'd be first steeped in the sacred Cup; But then the same *Rituals* direct also, that this Host shou'd be put upon the *Paten*, and laid upon a Chafin-dish, with burning Coals under it, till all the Moisture is evaporated, and the Host made very dry, that it may the longer hold uncorrupted. But surely to take this Host that has no Moisture at all in it, cannot in my Construction of Speech be understood so as to mean, that the Sick Man doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ. 'Tis indeed to partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, when it is taken after this Manner; because both are under one Kind: But to drink a thing that is not liquid, is a manner of speaking as yet unheard of. Nor is it out of any Fear of not giving the Body and Blood of Christ to the Sick under the Species of Bread, if it were not first dipped in the sacred Cup, that they observe this Practice, but to signify, as *Denis Barsalibi* a famous *Grecian* Author, and some of their *Liturgies*, inform us; that Christ is but  
one

one in two Natures, and to this Purpose say : *This is the Body of that Blood, and the Blood of that Body*, when they make the Intinction of the Host in the Chalice ; not unlike the Practice observed in the *Roman Missal*, of mixing a Particle of the Host, with the sacred Blood in the Chalice, when the Priest says ; “ *Hæc Commixtio & Consecratio Corporis & Sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fiat accipientibus nobis in vitam æternam, Amen.* ” *May this mixture and Consecration of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, avail us who receive it, unto the Life Everlasting, Amen.* And since this is practis'd at every *Mass*, and before either the Priest, or any of the People receive the Sacrament, and that this Intinction or Mixture of one Host with the Chalice, of the many Hosts upon the Altar, and that this is done at every *Mass* before the Sacrament is given to any Body ; I see no reason why we may not as justly say, all the Hosts on the Altar are sanctified to the same Purpose, that is, to signify the Union of the divine and human Nature in one Christ, by the Mixture of one Host with the Blood in the Chalice, as well as if all the Hosts on the Altar had been mixed with it ; since they are all, both that which is mixt and those that are not, one and the same Christ. Hence I think it appears, that all the Difference between the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches on this Subject is, that the *Greeks* do by many Actions, what the *Latins* do by one only. That is, the *Greeks* mix every *Host* they give the Sick in Bed with the Blood ; whereas the *Latins* mix only one *Host* ; which with the Blood is taken by the Priest at the Altar, to compleat the Sacrifice, and



and reserve the Remaining Hosts for the People. But that the Practice of the *Greeks* herein, is not grounded upon their Belief of a Necessity of taking the Sacrament in both Kinds, in Order to express the Death and Passion of Christ, that is, of taking his Body a Part, and his Blood a Part, to commemorate the real Separation of his Body from his Blood upon the Cross; is evident by another Practice of theirs subsequent to this, namely, that, as I said before, they dry the Hosts that are mixt with the Chalice over a Chaffing-dish, till all the Moisture is evaporated, before they give them to the Sick. For these Hosts thus dried are no more capable of expressing the separation of Christ's Blood from his Body upon the Cross, than the Hosts given by the *Latins* to the People. Nor does their Manner of giving the Sacrament to the People at publick Service express it much better. For it is evident by their *Rituals* and *Rubricks*, that for many Ages past, they communicate the People at publick Service, with the Host dipp'd or steep'd in the Chalice, and with a little Spoon consecrated to that purpose, take it out of the Chalice and put it into the Mouths of the Communicants, which can no more express the real separation of Christ's Blood from his Body upon the Cross, than if they had given it under either Kind. For to express this Separation, they shou'd give the Body by it self, in one Action, and the Blood by it self in another.

Upon the whole. The Faith or Belief of the *Grecians*, and *Orientalis*, is the same with that of the *Latins* upon the Subject of the *Eucharist*, and their Practice or Discipline, in the main, the same. They believe the *Real Pre-*

## Of Communion in one Kind.

*sence*, and *Transubstantiation*, they believe the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, as the *Latins* do. They believe whole Christ, Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, to be under either Kind. And if they administer the Sacrament to the People with some Difference, tho' not much, from the manner it is administered in the *Latin Church*, this only shews, that to give it to the Laity in one or both Kinds, is but a Matter of Discipline, which must of necessity be always somewhat different, in different Countries. But of this enough.

Had your Grace been pleased, in citing the Canon of the Council of *Constance*, to add a few Words more after the words *non obstante*, &c. I am humbly of Opinion, the Matter in debate wou'd be set in a clearer Light: I shall therefore beg leave to insert them here: " *Licet*  
 " *Christus post Carnam instituerit, et suis Disci-*  
 " *pulis administraverit sub utraque specie Panis*  
 " *et vini hoc venerabile Sacramentum: Tamen*  
 " *hoc non obstante, Sacrorum Canonum Autho-*  
 " *ritas, laudabilis et approbata Consuetudo Ec-*  
 " *clesiæ servavit et servat, Quod hujusmodi Sa-*  
 " *cramentum non debet confici post Carnam,*  
 " *neque a Fidelibus recipi non Jejunis, nisi in Casu*  
 " *Infirmittatis, aut alterius Necessitatis, a Jure vel*  
 " *Ecclesia concessio vel admissio. Et sicut hæc*  
 " *Consuetudo ad evitanda Pericula et Scandala,*  
 " *est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in pri-*  
 " *mitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum recipe-*  
 " *retur a Fidelibus sub utraque Specie, postea a*  
 " *conficientibus sub utraque, & a Laicis tantum-*  
 " *modo sub Specie Panis suscipiatur: Cum firmis-*  
 " *sime credendum sit, & nullatenus dubitandum,*

" in-

“ integrum Christi Corpus & Sanguinem tam sub  
 “ Specie Panis, quam sub Specie Vini veraciter  
 “ contineri. Unde cum hujusmodi Consuetudo ab  
 “ Ecclesia, & Sanctis Patribus rationabiliter in-  
 “ troducta & duitissime observata sit, habenda est  
 “ pro Lege quam non licet reprobare, aut sine  
 “ Ecclesiæ Authoritate pro Libito mutare.’ *Tho’*  
*Christ did institute this venerable Sacrament af-*  
*ter Supper, and administered it to his Disciples,*  
*under both Species of Bread and Wine: Tamen*  
*hoc non obstante. Yet this notwithstanding, the*  
*Authority of the sacred Canons, the laudable and*  
*approved Custom of the Church hath kept and*  
*doth keep, that this Sacrament ought not to be*  
*made after Supper, nor to be taken by the Faith-*  
*ful but fasting, except in Case of Sickness or other*  
*Necessity, allowed or admitted by Law or by the*  
*Church. And as this Custom was rationally in-*  
*troduced to avoid some Dangers and Scandals,*  
*that tho’ in the primitive Church this Sacrament*  
*was received by the Faithful under both Species,*  
*afterwards by those who made it under both, and*  
*taken by the Laity under the Species of Bread*  
*alone: Since it is firmly to be believed, and no*  
*Ways to be doubted, that the intire Body and*  
*Blood of Christ are truly contained, as well un-*  
*der the Species of Bread, as under the Species of*  
*Wine. Wherefore since this Custom has been ra-*  
*tionally introduced, and very long observed by*  
*the Church, and the holy Fathers, it is to be*  
*deemed a Law, which it is lawful to reject or to*  
*change at Pleasure, without the Authority of the*  
*Church. I think, My Lord, it is plain by the ve-*  
*ry Words of this Canon, that the Non obstante* *†*  
*refers to the Institution of the Sacrament after*



Supper, and to the Administration of it to those that were not fasting; and is not your Grace as much concerned in this *Non obstante* as the Roman Catholicks, since you never make the Sacrament after Supper, nor give it but to such as are presumed to be Fasting? Your Grace will possibly say: Your Quarrel with us is not for not giving the Sacrament after Supper, or to such as are fasting; but because we do not give it to the Laity under both Kinds, to which I answer, that our Question at present, is whether the *Non obstante* of the Council of *Constance* refers to the Institution under both Kinds, or to the making or consecrating the Sacrament, after Supper, or the administering of it to the People not fasting. And the Words of the Council say plainly it is to the latter. As to the lawfulness of giving it to the Laity in one Kind. I think I have sufficiently made it out in the foregoing Pages. Had the Council of *Constance* said, that tho' Christ did Institute or Consecrate this Sacrament under both Species of Bread and Wine, *tamen hoc non obstante*, we command and order it shall be made or Consecrated under the Species of Bread alone, your Grace wou'd have a great deal of Reason to find Fault with our Conduct. But surely you know too well, My Lord, we never made any such Law or Command, neither do we ever make or consecrate the Sacrament, without both Species of Bread and Wine. Now to quarrel with us for giving it to the Laity under one of these Species or Kinds, without the other is as groundless, as if a Man shou'd say: God did command all Mankind to increase and multiply, why therefore shou'd not every Man take a Wife,

and

and every Woman, a Husband, in Obedience to this Command? And so baffle the Doctrine of St. Paul: *He that giveth her (his Virgin) in Marriage, doth well, but he that giveth her not doth better.* 1. Cor. 7. 38. The Institution of a Thing, My Lord, does not always infer a Necessity of complying with every particular Fact and Circumstance of it, but only with Essentials, that the main End and Scope of what is intended by it, be not frustrated. Now when Christ did Institute the Mystery of the *Eucharist*, he did, as I often said before, intend to make not only a *Sacrament*, but also to offer a *Sacrifice*; which was to express his Death on the Cross, by the Mystical Separation of his Body from his Blood, under the Type of the Bread and the Wine, as his Blood was really separated from his Body at his Passion, and to command his Apostles only, and in their Persons the Priests, who were to succeed them in the priestly Function to do the same Thing, and to take his Body and Blood, separately under these different Types; because the taking and consuming of both Kinds or Species is essentially necessary in order to Compleat the *Sacrifice*; And when this *Sacrifice* was thus offer'd and compleated for the Remission of the Sins both of the Priest and the People, all that the People wanted, in order to partake of and to share in it, was to take a Part of the *Sacrifice*, by way of a *Sacrament*, and whether they did this by taking it in one or both Kinds, is the same to all Intents and Purposes; since he that takes more has nothing over, and he that takes less has no lack, as it is recorded of the *Manna*, which was a Type of the *Eucha-*

## Of Purgatory.

*rifi*: Christ's intire Body and Blood being under either Kind, as I think, I have already very well proved.

## C H A P. IX.

## Of Purgatory.

**Y**Our Grace's 29th. Paragraph, is concerning *Purgatory*. Here your Grace displays your Eloquence and Erudition, in the Animadversions you are pleased to make upon the Custom and Practice of the Christians, for three or four hundred Years after Christ, with Respect to their praying for the dead; and in the ingenious Interpretation you put upon *St. Paul's* Words, *1. Cor. Cap. 3.* All which as they are not very material to the Point in debate, I shall pass over, and only desire the Reader to consider the holy Lives of the Pastors and Teachers of these three or four hundred Years, their Zeal for the Glory of God, their Detestation of Error and *Heretic*, their Proximity to the Apostolical Times; and see whether they were not more likely to know the Doctrine and Practice of Christ, and his Apostles, than those who came to the World 1500. Years or more after Christ; all this, I say, I shall pass over and answer this your Grace's *Quare*: *Did the Apostles every where teach the Christian Church under Pain of Damnation, to believe that there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detained are relieved by the Suffrages of the Faithful?* I answer, they did teach the Christian Church to believe



lieve under Pain of Damnation a Doctrine equivalent to it, tho' possibly not in the same Terms. The Apostles taught the Christians to believe the Doctrine, and nothing but the Doctrine, which Jesus Christ deliver'd to them. Jesus Christ commanded the Christians under Pain of Damnation, to believe all Things whatsoever he had deliver'd unto the Apostles. *He that believeth and is Baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be Damned.* Mark, 16. 16. Consequently, if the Apostles taught the Christian Church this Doctrine, they are bound under Pain of Damnation to believe it. All that is incumbent upon me then is, to prove the Apostles did teach this Doctrine.

And here, I hope your Grace will not insist upon the Word *Purgatory*, which possibly was not known to the Ancients, of the first or second Century. It was a Term invented to express more fully the Doctrine of the Church in reference to the Prayers offer'd for the Dead; as the Word *Consubstantial* was by the *Nicean* Fathers, to express the Equality of the Son with the Father; or as the Word *Hypostasis*, which always before signified any Substance, is now by Divines used, and consecrated to signify only the Persons or Personalities in the *Trinity*. But if the Apostles taught the Christians to believe what is meant by the Word *Purgatory*; viz. That there is a third Place (which is neither Heaven, nor the Hell of the Damned) where some Souls are detained; and that the Souls in this Place are assisted, or relieved by the Prayers, Oblations, and other Works of Mercy perform-

ed by the living for their Relief. I humbly conceive, My Lord, it were trifling to dispute about the Word *Purgatory*, (which yet was well known in the Church in the Days of Saint *Augustin*) or the Fire of it; for neither the Council of *Trent*, nor any other general Council did ever determin whether it was a real and elementary Fire, or whether it was an Anguish of Mind, or some other Pain capable to afflict the Soul, and render it uneasy, in such a Situation.

Now that the Apostles did teach the Christian Church such a Doctrine, we are as well assured, as we are, that they wrote the Epistles, which go under their Names, or that the four Gospels, are the Words and Doctrine of Christ reduced to Writing. We have for the Truth of it, the Constant and uninterrupted Tradition of all the Churches in the World, whether *Orthodox*, *Schismatical* or *Heretical*, from the Beginning of Christianity, to that of the sixteenth Century, and if that Rule recorded by *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, upon which we bilieve the Gospel to be the Word of God: "Quod ab omnibus, quod semper, quod ubique." *That which was believed by all Men, in all Times, and in all Places*, be true; the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is upon this Foundation. All the Christians from the Beginning practiced it; all the ancient *Liturgies* recommended it, and all the Fathers, Doctors, and Pastors of the Church taught it. So that one may as well doubt of any, the best attested Point of Faith, as that of Prayers for the Dead; and that, in such a Manner, as supposed their Souls to be eased by such Prayers. However, for your Grace's Satisfaction, I shall borrow a few Passages from the ancient *Liturgies*,  
and

and from some of the ancient Fathers in Confirmation of this Doctrine.

To begin with the *Liturgy* of St. *Clement*. I made no mention of this *Liturgy* hitherto, (tho' it be as ancient as those of St. *James* or St. *Mark*, and is put at the Head of all the *Liturgies* translated into English by Doctor *Brett*) because it was not used in any Church that I can find. However for it's Antiquity, we ought to have a great Value for the Doctrine and Practice which it recommends, as being of the purest of Times, and next to that of the very Apostles. This *Liturgy* then tells us, that in a Prayer desired by the *Deacon*, to be made by the Bishop, at the divine *Sacrifice*, these Words are read: *Let us commemorate the holy Martyrs, that we may be deemed worthy, to be Partakers of their Tryal, Let us pray for all those who have died in the Faith.* Here your Grace sees the Difference between the *Martyrs* and the other *Faithful* departed. The *Martyrs* are to be commemorated, and the other *Faithful* to be prayed for. The *Martyrs* are commemorated, that we may obtain the Grace to follow their Example, and the other *Faithful* are prayed for, that God may be Merciful to them, and forgive them the Sins they did not expiate and atone for, before they left this Life; what else can be the Meaning of this different Conduct of the Church, with Respect to these different Sorts of *Faithful* departed? The *Martyrs* were then in Heaven, and the other *Faithful* not in Hell, out of which there is no Redemption, but in a third Place, where they were supposed to be in such Circumstances, as that they might be help'd and reliev'd by the Prayers and Oblations Offer'd for them to God; and



and this third Place is what we call *Purgatory*:

The *Liturgy* of *St. James* is somewhat fuller upon this Head. For in the Prayer which the Priest puts up to God after the Consecration of the holy Mysteries; the Deacon recommends to him to add these Words: *For the Remission of our Sins, and the Reconciliation of our Souls, and for all that are under Affliction and Calamity, and that want the Mercy and Assistance of God, for the Conversion of those that are in Error, and the Recovery of the Sick; for the Deliverance of Captives, and for the Repose of our Fathers and Brethren that are Gone before us, Let us pray earnestly and say, Lord have Mercy. The People say three Times. Lord have Mercy.*

*For the Repose of our Fathers and Brethren:* They were then supposed, by the Church, to be in a State of Suffering and of wanting Repose; and what is this, but to be in a third Place which we call *Purgatory*.

In *St. Mark's Liturgy*, we read this Prayer at the End of the *Anaphora*: *Give Rest, O Lord, our God, to the Souls of our Fathers and Brethren, who are departed in the Faith of Christ: Be mindful of our Forefathers, from the Beginning of the World, of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Bishops Saints, &c.* And again when the Deacon has read the *Dypticks* of the Dead, the Priest bows down and prays after this manner: *Give Rest to the Souls of all these, O Lord our God, in the Tabernacles of thy Saints; Dispenſe unto them in thy King-*  
dom

dom those good Things which thou hast promised, which Eye hath not seen, nor Ear heard, neither have enter'd into the Heart of Man; which thou hast prepared, O God, for those who love thy holy Name. Give Rest to their Souls, and vouchsafe them the Kingdom of Heaven.

In the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, when the Deacon makes an End of reading the Dypticks, and Remembring so many of the Dead and living as he thinks fit, the Priest prays thus for the living: For Health, Protection, and Remission of the Sins of N. the Servant of God.

For the Dead, he says: For the Rest and Forgiveness of the Soul of thy Servant N. give it Rest, O God, in a pleasant Place, where there is no Sorrow or Mourning, but where it may rejoice in the Light of thy Countenance.

For the Rest and Forgiveness of the Soul of thy Servant N. It wanted then Rest and Forgiveness. It was then in Pain for want of this Rest and Forgiveness. And is not this then, to be in Purgatory?

In the Liturgy of St. Basil, when the Dypticks are read, the Priest prays after the same Manner, both for the Living and the Dead. For the Living he prays for Health, and Protection, and Remission of the Sins of N. the Servant of God.

For the Dead, he says: For the Rest and Forgiveness of the Soul of thy Servant N. Give it Rest, O God, in a pleasant Place, where there is no Sorrow or Mourning.

## Of Purgatory.

In the same *Liturgy* as used in the *Patriarchate* of *Alexandria*, after the *Dypticks* are read by the *Deacon*, the *Priest* says:

*Receive their Souls, O Lord, grant them Rest, and vouchsafe them thine heavenly Kingdom.*

This *Liturgy* then, supposes they were not as yet, (tho' Dead) in the Kingdom of Heaven. Nor would it put up any Prayers for them, had it supposed them to have been in Hell. It must therefore, suppose them to be in a third Place, where they wanted *Rest* and *Forgiveness* of their Sins; which surely is to be in *Purgatory*.

In the *Ethiopian Liturgy*, Where the *Priest* prays for all the People, for the King, for all Christians, for Travellers, for the Fruits of the Earth, for the Bishops of the Church, and for Men in all Stations: He adds these Words for the Dead: *Give Rest to our Fathers, and Brethren, who are fallen a sleep, and departed from us in the Orthodox Faith.*

In the *Liturgy* of *Nestorius*, who as I observed before, together with his Sect has been condemned for *Heresy* in the Council of *Ephesus*, and who has had no Commerce or Communication in sacred Rites, with any of the Orthodox Believers, these 1250 Years, the *Priest* prays thus for the Dead: *We pray and beseech thee, O Lord, thro' this Oblation, to be mindful of our Forefathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Teachers, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and all others, who have been Partners in our Ministry, and are gone before us, and all our Brethren in Christ, who are departed this Life in the true Faith, whose Names thou knowest; and to remit and Pardon through the Petitions and Intercessions of those who have*  
pleased



*pleased thee, all the Sins, and Offences committed against thee.*

Here it is worthy our Notice, that this *Liturgy* prays God to be mindful of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors; and of others whom it supposes to have pleased God, and to desire that God may remit and Pardon the Sins and Offences of other deceased Souls thro' their Petitions and Intercessions.

In the *Liturgy* of *Severus* who, as I observed before likewise, together with his Sect have deserted the Church these 1200 Years and more: The Priest puts up this prayer: *Remember, O Lord, the Priests, Deacons, Subdeacons, Readers, Singers, Expounders, Confessors, Monks and those who have vowed perpetual Virginity: Give them Courage, and a becoming Modesty, and remember all Conditions of Men who are departed in Christ, and for whom these Oblations are offer'd.* N. B. This *Liturgy*, not only prays for the Dead, but also offers sacrifices for them.

It is very hard, My Lord, to add any thing to such authentick Evidence. These *Liturgies* are the standing and perpetual Monuments of the Faith and Practice of the Apostles. The three first are as ancient, as the Apostles. themselves; and the most modern of the Rest is 1200 Years old and more, *St. Basil* and *St. John Chrysostom*, were Men of so great Piety, Learning, and Zeal for the Orthodox Faith, that we may safely pronounce upon their sayings. And *Nestorius* and *Severus*, were indeed great Men, tho' unfortunately prepossessed in Favour of their own prejudicate Notions, which made them forsake the Catholick Communion, and drew great Multitudes after them; yet they still retained

tained and their Successors to this Day, the Doctrine of the *Sacrifice* of the Body and Blood of Christ; the *Real Presence*, and *Transubstantiation*, the *Invocation of Saints*, and Prayers and Sacrifice for the Repose or Rest of the Souls of the *Faithful* departed; which is an evident Sign that all these Points were Part of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church before they separated from it, the General Councils who condemn'd said *Hereticks* having never branded them for this Doctrine or Practice. St. James heard Christ pronounce these Words: *Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this World, nor in the World to come.* Matth. 12. 32. He therefore concluded, that there were some Sins to be forgiven in the World to Come. He heard him say also: *Agree with thine Adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the Way with him: Lest at any Time the Adversary deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the Officer, and thou be cast into Prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no Means come out thence till thou hast paid the last Farthing.* Matth. 5. 25. 26. He heard Christ say many other things, that are not recorded in Scripture, in Relation to the Doctrine which he and the rest of the Disciples were to deliver to the Faithful, and to the Practice they were to observe. These St. James deliver'd as a sacred *Depositum* to the Church of *Jerusalem*, of which he was the first Bishop; and his Successors to their Successors in a Traditionary Form, till *Constantine the Great* gave Peace to the whole Catholick Church; and it was then that this Doctrine and Practice were compiled, and set in the Method and order they now stand in. And for

as much as it was the Doctrine and Practice deliver'd by this Apostle to the Church of *Jerusalem*, it has ever since carried the Name of the *Liturgy of St. James*.

*St. Mark* and *St. Clement* heard *Saint Peter* preach the same Doctrine, and use the same Practice in *Rome*. *St. Clement*, or some other Apostolical Man of his Age, or of the next, reduced the same to writing under the Title of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, out of which this *Liturgy* that goes under his Name was afterwards Compiled; and was the first that appeared in Writing. *St. Mark*, being sent by *St. Peter* to *Egypt*, founded the Church of *Alexandria*, and deliver'd the said Doctrine and Practice to the Faithful, and to his Successor in a Traditionary Form, as did all the Churches founded by all the Apostles, till the Days of the Emperor *Constantine*. All the other *Liturgies* now extant, were compiled after the Model of these three Apostolical One's, viz. *St. Clement's*, *St. James's*, and *St. Mark's*; and even the latest of them was reduced to writing, in the form it now stands, before the latter End of the fifth Century; Yet there is not one of them all, which does not recommend to the Faithful to pray for the *Repose* or *Rest* of the Souls of those who died in the Communion of the Church.

This I humbly conceive, My Lord, is sufficient to evince, that tho' the Apostles did not under pain of Damnation teach the Churches to believe the Word Purgatory; yet that they taught them under pain of Damnation to believe the Doctrine which we mean by Purgatory, viz. That the Souls who have not fully expiated the Guilt of their Sins in this World, nor made due Satis-



Satisfaction, and died with a true Sorrow, and with the Peace of the Church, are detained in a Place, in Pain, wanting Repose or Rest, till they are purged of the Dross of their Sins, like Gold tryed in the Fire ; either by the prayers and Sacrifices of the Church or by the Alms and Prayers of their Friends on Earth, or by the Pain which they suffer. However, let us see, My Lord, what the primitive Fathers thought of this Doctrine and Practice.

I shall begin with a Passage taken out of St. Cyril of *Jerusalem's* fifth *Mystagogical Catechism*, made English by Dr. Brett, and Cited before upon another Occasion.

“ But then (saith this Father) when we have  
 “ finished the Spiritual Sacrifice, the unbloody  
 “ Worship in that *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, we  
 “ pray to God for the common Peace of the  
 “ Church, for the Tranquility of the World,  
 “ for Kings, for the Armies, and those that  
 “ fight with them, for the Sick and Afflicted  
 “ and in a word, we pray to thee for all that  
 “ need Assistance, and offer this *Sacrifice* unto  
 “ thee. Then we also make Mention of those  
 “ who are at Rest before us : First the Patri-  
 “ archs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that God  
 “ through their prayers and Supplications would  
 “ receive our prayers: Then we pray for the  
 “ deceased Fathers and Bishops. Lastly, for all  
 “ those that once lived with us, and are now  
 “ departed : believing it to be a great Benefit  
 “ unto their Souls for whom prayer is made,  
 “ whilst the *Holy and Tremendous Sacrifice* lies  
 “ before us.

“ Which I will shew you by an Example,  
 “ For I know that many say, what signifies it to

“ a Soul to be Mentioned in our Prayers, whether it went out of the World with Sins or without ? For if any King should send into Banishment those who have offended him, but afterwards some of their Friends making a Crown, should offer it to him in behalf of those that are thus punished ; would he not be disposed to remit their punishment ? In like Manner we offering Prayers for the Dead, although they were Sinners, do not make a Crown, but offer Christ, who is the Lover of Men, gracious and propitious both to them and ourselves.”

St. Gregory Nyssen. in his Oration for the Dead, confirms this Doctrine : *A Man (says he) is purged of his Sins either in this present Life by Prayer, and the Love of Wisdom, or after Death expiates them by the Furnace of a purging Fire, if he would return to his former Happiness, and a little after : No Man can, when he leaves his Body, be partaker of the Divinity, except a purging Fire shall take away the Spots imprinted on his Soul.*

St. Hilary, holds the same Language upon these Words of the Psalm 118. *Concupivit Anima mea desiderare Judicia Justitiæ tuæ :* “ Nobis (says he.) est illè indefessus Ignis obundus, in quo subeunda sunt grævia illa expianda a Peccatis Animæ Supplicia.” *We must undergo that incessant Fire, in which the grievous Punishments of the Soul must be endured in order to atone for our Sins.*

St. Jerome to the same purpose in the End of his Commentary upon the Prophet Isaias : “ Si- cut (says he) Diaboli et omnium Negatorum atque Impiorum, qui dixerunt in Corde suo,  
M “ non

“ non est Deus, credimus æterna Tormenta,  
 “ sic Peccatorum atque Impiorum, et tamen  
 “ Christianorum, quorum Opera in Igne pro-  
 “ banda atque purganda sunt, moderatam arbi-  
 “ tramur, et mixtam Clementiæ sententiam Ju-  
 “ dicis.” *As we believe, that the Devils and  
 all Atheists and wicked Men, who said in their  
 Hearts, there is no God, must suffer eternal  
 Torments, so we suppose that the Sentence of the  
 Judge pronounced against Sinners, and impious  
 Christians whose Works are to be tryed and  
 purged by Fire, shall be temper'd and mixt with  
 Clemency.*

St. Austin de Cura pro Mortuis, Cap. 1. Con-  
 firmis this Doctrine; “ In Machabeorum Libro  
 “ (says he) legimus oblatum pro Mortuis Sacri-  
 “ ficiū, sed etsi nusquam in Scripturis veteri-  
 “ bus legeretur, non parva est universæ Ecclesiæ,  
 “ quæ in hac Consuetudine claret, Autoritas;  
 “ Ubi in Precibus Sacerdotis, quæ Domino Deo  
 “ ad ejus Altare funduntur, Locum suum habet  
 “ etiam Commendatio Mortuorum.” *We read  
 in the Book of the Machabæes that Sacrifice was  
 offer'd for the Dead. But tho' we should  
 read it no where in the old Scripture, yet the  
 Authority of the universal Church, which shines  
 in this Custom is not little, where, in the Prayers  
 of the Priest, which are put up to our Lord God  
 at his Altar, the Commendation of the Dead hath  
 it's Place. And again, Homily 16. de 50. Hæc  
 “ Pæna illos manebit, qui amisso et non reparato  
 “ per Pænitentiam Baptismo, in æternum peri-  
 “ bunt. Ad quos dicitur. Paleas autem comburet  
 “ Igni inextinguibili. Hi verò qui temporali-  
 “ bus Pænis digna gesserunt, de quibus Apostolus  
 \* 1 Cor. 3. “ dicit, \* Si cujus opus arserit, Detrimentum  
 “ patietur*



" *patietur, ipse autem saluus erit. Sic tamen*  
 " *quasi per Ignem. Per Fluvium igneum, de*  
 " *quo Propheticus sermo commemorat, † Et* <sup>† Daniel 7</sup>  
 " *Fluvius igneus currebat ante eum. Per Fluvi-*  
 " *um igneum et Vada ferventibus Globis horren-*  
 " *da transibunt. Quanta fuerit peccati Mate-*  
 " *ria, tanta et pertranseundi Mora. Quantum*  
 " *exegerit Culpa, tantum sibi ex Homine vendi-*  
 " *cabit quardam Flammæ rationabilis Disciplina.*  
 " *Et quantum stulta Iniquitas suggererit,*  
 " *tantum sapiens pœna desæviet. Et quia sermo*  
 " *divinus quodam Loco aneæ Ollæ Animam*  
 " *peccatricem comparat, dicens \* Pone illam* <sup>\* Ezech. 24.</sup>  
 " *super Prunas vacuam, donec concalescat æs*  
 " *eius, et omne stagnum eius defluat: Illic ser-*  
 " *mones otiosi et Cogitationes iniquæ vel for-*  
 " *didæ, illic Multitudo levium Peccatorum, quæ*  
 " *Puritatem nobilis Naturæ infecerant, exun-*  
 " *dabunt: Illic stagnum vel Plumbum diverfo-*  
 " *rum subrepentium Delictorum, quæ divinam*  
 " *Imaginem obscuraverant, consumentur: Quæ*  
 " *omnia hic ab Anima separari per Eleemo-*  
 " *synas et Lachrymas compendiosa Trans-*  
 " *actione potuissent. This Punishment will re-*  
 " *main for those, who having lost, and not re-*  
 " *paired by Penance their Baptism, will perish*  
 " *for ever. To whom it is said he will burn the*  
 " *Chaff with unquenchable Fire. But those who*  
 " *have done things worthy of temporal Punish-*  
 " *ment, of whom the Apostle says: \* If any Man's* <sup>\* 1 Cor. 13.</sup>  
 " *Work shall burn he shall suffer a Loss, but he*  
 " *himself shall be saved yet so as by Fire: By a*  
 " *fiery River, of which the Prophetical Speech*  
 " *makes mention, † and a fiery River ran before* <sup>† Daniel 7.</sup>  
 " *him. They shall pass through a fiery River and*  
 " *Fords dreadful with fiery Balls. As great*

" as the Matter of the Sin shall be, so shall the  
 " delay of the Passage. As much as the Fault shall  
 " require so much shall the Discipline of a rati-  
 " onal Flame be revenged on the Man: As much  
 " as foolish Iniquity shall suggest, so much shall  
 " wise Punishment enrage. And for as much  
 " as the divine Word, doth in a certain Place  
 " compare a sinful Soul to a Brazen Pot, saying: \*  
 " Put it empty upon burning Coals till it's  
 " Brass grows hot, and all it's Moisture evaporates.  
 " Here idle Words, and iniquitous or filthy  
 " Thoughts, there a multitude of light Sins,  
 " which infected the Purity of noble Nature,  
 " shall be washed away: Here shall be consumed  
 " the Pool or the Lead of Diverse Insinuating  
 " Faults, which have sullied the divine Image;  
 " all which might have been here separated from  
 " the Soul in a compendious Way by Alms and  
 " Tears."

\* Ezech.  
 24.

Again, Lib. 2. de Genes: contra Manichæos  
 Cap. 20. He hath these Words: " Qui torté  
 " Agrum non coluerit, & Spinis eum opprimi  
 " permiserit, habet in hac Vitâ Maledictionem  
 " Terræ suæ in omnibus Operibus suis, & post  
 " hanc Vitam habebit, vel Ignem Purgationis vel  
 " Pœnam æternam." He who perhaps will not  
 till his Land, but will suffer it to be choaked with  
 Thorns, hath in this Life the Curse of his own  
 Land in all his Works, and will have after this  
 Life either a Fire of Purgation, or Pain eternal.  
 And in Enar. Psal. 37. he saith: (commenting  
 upon the Words of St. Paul, He shall be saved  
 yet so as by Fire.) " Quia dicitur, salvus erit,  
 " ille Ignis contemnitur, ita planè quamvis sal-  
 " vum per Ignem: Gravior tamen erit ille Ignis,  
 " quum quidquid potest Homo pati in hac Vita."

Because

*Because it is said; He shall be saved, that Fire is despised, so it is indeed: Tho' he shall be saved by Fire: Yet this Fire will be more grievous than any thing that a Man can suffer in this Life.* By this you may see My Lord, St. *Austin* was not of the same Opinion with your Grace in Relation to the Sense or Meaning of the Words of St. *Paul* in his third Chapter to the *Corinthians*.

Thus much I believe, My Lord, may suffice to shew the Grounds we have for the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, But if your Grace wou'd have further Satisfaction, be pleased to consult *Tertullianus* Lib. de Corona Milit. & Lib. de Monoga. *Cyprianus* Lib. 1. Epist. 9. *Origenes*. Homil. 6. in Exod. *Theophilactus*, in Cap. 12. *Luce*. *Ambrosius* Lib. 2. Epistola 8. ad *Faustinum*. *Hieronimus* in Epist. ad *Pamachium* *Athanasius* Quæst. 34. ad *Antiochum*. *Gregorius Naz.* in Orat. in *Cesarium*, *Eusebius Cesar.* Lib. 4. de Vita *Constat.* *Epiph.* Hæresi, 75. *Chrysostom.* Hom. 69. ad *Popul.* *Paulinus Nolanus* in Epist. ad *Pamachium*. *Gregorius Magnus* Lib. 4. Dialog. Cap. 39. *Eusebius Emiffenus*. Homil. 3. de *Epiphania*. These were the great Luminaries of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth Ages of the Church; to which I might add all the Fathers and Doctors of all the subsequent Ages to our own Days. So that to question the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, that is, of a place which is neither Heaven, nor the Hell of the Damned, where Souls departed are detained till they are purged of the Sins for which they did not make due Satisfaction in this Life, by the Alms, and Prayers of the Living, or by the Sacrifice of the Altar, or by



the Pains they there endure, is in reality as much as to Question the Truth of the Gospel; since we have the self same universal Tradition of all Persons, at all times, and in all Places for the one as for the other; even by the Testimony of Learned Protestants affirming the same for Instance Bishop Forbes in his *Discourse of Purgatory*. *Let not the ancient Practice* (says he) *of praying and making Oblation for the Dead, received throughout the universal Church, almost from the very Times of the Apostles, be any more rejected by Protestants as unlawful, or vain; let them reverence the Judgment of the Primitive Church, and admit a Practice strengthened by the uninterrupted Profession of so many Ages.—— The universal Church has believed this Practice not only to be lawful, but likewise beneficial to the Souls departed.—— Let it be granted, that this Custom was always judged lawful, and also profitable by pious Antiquity, and most universally received at all Times in the Church.*

The Case being then so, My Lord, I beg Leave to expostulate a little with your Grace, upon a Thought just now come into my Head, which is not foreign to this Subject. It is frequently thrown in our Dish, as the greatest Mark of our want of Charity, that we do not allow Salvation to any *Hereticks* or *Schismatics*. Tho' we do not take upon us to Judge of the State of any Man after Death, because we do not know, but that at the Hour of his Death, or at some Time before it, he might have renounced his Errors have return'd to the Communion of the Church, repented of his Sins, and have obtain'd Mercy from God; And is it not as great a Mark of the Want of Charity to believe,

lieve, that all those who die with any Kind of Sin, will go to Hell and be damn'd, which the denying of *Purgatory* necessarily implies? For since no Soul, that has the least Spot or Blemish, can enter the Kingdom of Heaven, till such Spots are washed away, that the very † *Just Man falls seven Times* (in the Day;) and that moreover, many of our Actions, have a mixture of Imperfection, Something of Vanity, of self Love; 'Tis manifest, that for one Man who leaves this World without any Spot or Blemish, or not obnoxious to God's Justice for the Sins of his past Life; there die a Million of Men under some, of these Circumstances. And if there be not a Place for such Souls, to purge their Sins, by suffering for them, Doth it not necessarily follow they go all to Hell out of which there is no Redemption? But of this enough.

† *Proverbs*  
24. 16.

C H A P. X.

*Of the Veneration of Relicks.*

**I**N the 30th. Paragraph your Grace asks these Questions: "Did the Apostles every where teach the Christian Church, under Pain of Damnation, to believe, that the Saints in Heaven are to be worshipped and pray'd to? That their Relicks are to be worshipped? Or that their Images, as also the Images of Christ, and the blessed Virgin, ought to be had and retained, and that due Honour and Worship ought to be given to them? Or that the Roman Church is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches?"

“ Churches? Or that St. *Peter* was the Prince  
 “ of the Apostles? Or that the Bishop of *Rome*  
 “ as his Successor, is the *Vicar* of *Jesus Christ*?  
 “ Again: Did not all other Christian Churches,  
 “ and even the Church of *Rome* it self original-  
 “ ly spring from that Mother Church, which was  
 “ first planted at *Jerusalem*? And if so, how can  
 “ the *Roman Church* be the Mother of all other  
 “ Churches?”

I have endeavour'd, My Lord, to give your  
 Grace Satisfaction upon all these Heads in my  
 Answer to the fifth and eight Paragraphs, bat-  
 ing that which relates to the Veneration of  
 Relicks, and that of the Church of *Rome's*  
 being the Mother of all other Churches. And  
 here I shall endeavour to vindicate these two  
 Points.

As to the Veneration of Relicks, or Wor-  
 ship, (if you will) for that is a very ambiguous  
 Word, I do not find in any of the Writings of  
 the Apostles, except that of St. *Luke* in the  
*Acts*, that they did teach such a Doctrine.  
 Their chief Business was to preach Christ Cruci-  
 fied, and to inculcate in the Minds of the Faith-  
 ful his Passion, Death, Resurrection, Ascension,  
 and all the other great *Mysteries* consequent  
 thereupon. Tho' it is not to be doubted, they  
 taught a great many other Things that are not  
 upon Record under their Hands; and if we  
 follow the Rule of St. *Augustin*, viz. That  
 where any Doctrine or Practice is held by the  
 universal Church, whose Beginning, is not to be  
 found, it must needs come from the Apostles; we  
 will easily conclude that the Veneration we have  
 for the Relicks of Saints is derived down to us  
 from them, and that they taught and practiced the



the same. For the Doctrine and Practice of the Veneration of Relicks, have been universally received by the whole Catholick Church both of the *East* and *West*, without any Trace or Footsteps of their Beginning at any Time, since the Apostles, but on the contrary, were held and practiced in the very Infancy of the Church. This is what I am to make out. In order thereunto, I shall in the *first* Place lay down what we understand by the Veneration of Relicks. In the *second* Place shew by Scripture, by the Fathers, and by the primitive Ecclesiastical Historians, that God did testify his Approbation of this Doctrine and Practice, by true and real Miracles.

As to the *first*, we mean no more by the Veneration of Relicks than that we esteem and honour, and out of respect, kiss the Bones, or Relicks of the Saints, or the Things which we believe to have touched their Bodies or Bones; and in Consequence hereof, we value them very much, and keep them as a precious Treasure; but we believe no Divinity to be in them, we refer the Respect we give them to the Saints themselves. We put no Confidence in them; we expect neither Favour nor Grace from them; but we honour and respect them, as happy Instruments of the Saint's Vertues, and of God's Glory which shines in the wonderful Works he has, from time to time, in all Ages performed by their means, to testify his Approbation of the Respect and Honour we pay them; or rather to encourage us to that Honour and Respect; and all this terminates finally in God himself, since the Honour and Respect exhibited to the Saints or their Relicks, must necessarily be referred

referred to him, who gave the Saints the Grace to subdue all the Passions of Flesh and Blood, to mortifie their Bodies, and to triumph over the Devil and the World, by means whereof they manifested the Power of his Grace, and became agreeable to him: "*Univerſa propter ſemetipſum operatus eſt Dominus.*" *The Lord hath made all things for himſelf.* Saith Salomon, Proverbs 16.4. "*Laudate Dominum in Sanctis ejus.*" *Praise ye the Lord in his Saints,* ſaith David Psalm 150.

In the ſecond place, let us hear what the Scripture, &c. ſays Concerning them.

We read in the 4th. Book of Kings Cap. 13. that the Prophet *Eliſeus* being dead and buried, certain Men carrying the Corps of a dead Man to his Grave, were frightened by Robbers, and caſt down the Body into the *Prophet's* Sepulchre, which, as ſoon as it touched his Bones, came to Life again. The Words of the Scripture are: "*Mortus eſt ergo Eliſeus, et ſepelientur eum: Latrunculi autem de Moab venerunt in Terram in ipſo Anno: Quidam autem ſepelientes Hominem, viderunt Latrunculos, et projecerunt Cadaver in Sepulchro Eliſei: Quod cum tetigiſſet Oſſa Eliſei, revixit Homo, et ſtetit ſuper pedes ſuos.*" Made English thus by your own Translators: *And Eliſha died, and they buried him: And the Bands of the Moabites invaded the Land at the coming in of the Year. And it came to paſs as they were burying a Man, that behold, they ſpied a Band of Men, and they caſt the Man into the Sepulchre of Eliſha; and when the Man was let down, and touched the Bones of Eliſha, he revived and ſtood upon his Feet. I wou'd fain know for what End was this great Miracle*

Miracle wrought by Almighty God, and recorded in Scripture? Surely it was to let the People then present, and Posterity know how much he valued and esteemed the very Bones of his great Servant; When he thus inverted the Order of Nature to manifest it. Again, *Acts*: 19. 11. 12. "Virtutesque non quolibet faciebat Deus per Manum Pauli: Ita ut etiam super Languidos deferrentur a Corpore ejus sudaria, & semicinctia & recedebant ab eis Languores, & Spiritus Nequam egrediebantur." Thus englished by yourselves: *And God wrought special Miracles by the Hands of Paul: So that from his Body were brought unto the Sick, Handkerchiefs and Aprons, and the Diseases departed from them, and the Evil Spirits went out of them.* I wish I had one of the Bones of *Eliseus*, or one of *St. Paul's* Handkerchiefs, I wou'd prefer no Treasure to them; and I dare affirm, your Grace wou'd not for their Weight in Gold, part with them, if you had them in your Possession, and were sure they were the same.

*Eusebius Casariensis*, Lib. 4. Cap. 15. *Histor. Eccles.* gives us an Account of the Martyrdom of *St. Polycarp*, a Disciple of the Apostles, which Account *Eusebius* took out of a Letter which the Church of *Smyrna* wrote to the Church of *Pontus*, relating the whole Tryal and Execution of the Holy Martyr, and which he says was extant in his Days and seen by himself. In this Letter, as *Eusebius* affirms, we are informed, that when *Polycarp* was burnt, the Christians gather'd his Bones with more earnestness than if they were precious Stones. The Words of the Letter are *οὐτως τὸ ἡμέτερον, &c.*



So did we afterward, gather out of the Ashes, and carry away his Bones, more precious than Jewels, and more pure than Gold, and laid them up in a proper Place. Here is an extraordinary Veneration for Bones, and a Value put upon them beyond Jewels, or precious Stones, by the Church of Smyrna, and who did the Church of Smyrna learn this Doctrine from; but from St. Polycarp himself? And who cou'd he learn it from, but from his Masters, the Apostles of Jesus Christ, and particulary from St. John the Evangelist, with whom he long conversed, and from whose Breast (as I may say) he sucked all his Spiritual Wisdom?

St. Gregory Nyssen in his funeral Oration upon Theodorus the Martyr, speaketh thus both of his Soul and Body: *The Soul, indeed, (says he) since it went on High, is at Rest in it's own Place, and being dissolved from the Body lives together with those of it's own Likeness. But the venerable and immaculate Body, it's Instrument, being dressed and adorned, is, with much Honour and Veneration, deposited in a magnificent and sacred Place.*

St. Austin Epist. ad Quintianum writes thus, to him concerning the Relicks of St. Stephen, which he sent him by the Bearers of his Letter. *"Portant sanè (says he) reliquias Beatissimi et Gloriosissimi Martyris Stephani, quas non ignorat Sanctitas Vestra, sicut et nos fecimus, quam convenienter honorare debeatis."* They carry, indeed, the Relicks of the most blessed and the most glorious Martyr Stephen, which your Holiness is not Ignorant how conveniently you ought to honour, as we have done.

St.

St. Gregory Nazianzen. in his Oration upon St. Cyprian: *The Dust of Cyprian (says he) can, with Faith do all things, as they know, who have experienced it, and have transmitted the Miracle unto us.*

St. Chrysostom Lib. contra Gentil. speaking of the Relicks of St. Babyla: *The Miracles which are Daily wrought by the Martyrs, abundantly confirm our Opinion.*

St. Jerome Lib. adversus Vigilantium: "Do-  
" let (says he) Martyrum Reliquias precioso  
" operiri Velamine, et non vel Pannis, vel Cili-  
" cijs colligari, vel projici in Sterquilinum:  
" Ut solus Vigilantius ebrius et dormiens  
" adoretur." Vigilantius is sorry the Relicks of  
the Martyrs shou'd be cover'd with a precious  
Vail, and not rather bundled together in Raggs  
or Sack-Cloth, or cast on the Dunghil: That  
Vigilantius alone drunk and a Sleep might be  
adored.

I shou'd never end, if I shou'd relate all the  
sayings of the Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Writers  
upon this Subject. Several National and Pro-  
vincial Councils in the Primitive Church, have  
decreed that no Altar or Memory of the Mar-  
tyrs shou'd be consecrated except Relicks be  
set in them. St. Athanasius, St. Cyril of Jerusalem,  
St. Basil, St. Epiphanius, St. Paulinus, Euse-  
bius Emisenus, Theodoretus, Sulpitius Severus,  
St. Leo, St. Gregory the Great, Venerable Bede,  
and many more in sundry Places extol the  
Veneration, which all Antiquity had for the  
Relicks of Saints and Martyrs. All Ecclesiasti-  
cal Historians Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoretus,  
Zozomenus, Evagrius, Necephorus, Rufinus,  
Sulpitius, and many others record innumerable  
Miracles

## Of the Veneration of Relicks.

Miracles wrought, at the Shrines and Relicks of the Martyrs and Saints. St. Jerome wrote a Book against *Vigilantius*, for denying the Invocation of *Saints*, and the Veneration of Relicks, in which he calls him a New Monster; as one, who merits the Name of *Dormitantius*, rather than that of *Vigilantius*. And St. Augustin. Lib. 22. Cap. 8. *De Civit. Dei*. enumerates more than twenty Miracles wrought, at the Memories, or Altars, where the Relicks of St. Stephen were set. So that to deny this Veneration, or, as your Grace terms it, worship, which is an ambiguous or equivocal Word, and is as often ascribed to Creatures, as to the Creator, but with this Difference, that the Worship we exhibit to the Creator, is called a Worship of true *Latria*, by which we acknowledge our Dependance upon Him, as upon our Supreme Lord and Maker; whereas the Worship we exhibit to the Creatures; if upon Account of the different Relations we have to them, or the Dignities and Stations they are in, we call a *Civil Worship*; and if upon Account of the Holiness of their Lives, and visible Power in working Miracles, a *Religious Worship* or Veneration: To deny, I say, this Veneration or Worship to the Relicks of the Martyrs, and Saints is to go Counter to all the Holy Fathers, to all Ecclesiastical Historians, and to the Practice of the universal Church, from the very Time of the Apostles to this Day.



C H A P. XI.

*Of the Infallibility of the Church.*

**T**ouching the *second* Point in the 30th. Paragraph : *Did not all other Christian Churches, and even the Church of Rome it self, originally spring from that Mother Church which was first planted in Jerusalem ?*

As these words lie, I beg leave, My Lord, to answer in the Negative, For the very Church of *Jerusalem* sprung from *St. Peter*, and the rest of the Apostles, and Disciples, who made up the Church of Christ before the particular Church of *Jerusalem* was founded, and *St. James* made or appointed it's Pastor; And many other Churches were founded, and planted by them without any Dependence upon the Church of *Jerusalem*. But for as much as I believe your Grace means only, that the Church of *Jerusalem* was older than the Church of *Rome*, that is, that there was a Church planted in *Jerusalem*, before there was any in *Rome* I answer, and say, We do not call the Church of *Rome* the *Mother* and *Mistress* of all other Churches, upon account of it's being older than that of *Jerusalem*, but upon account of it's Authority. The King is called *Pater Patriæ*, and Queen *Anne*, was called *Mater Patriæ*; not upon Account of their Age, but upon account of their Authority and Power to govern, to Rule, and to administer Justice : In like Manner the Church of *Rome* is not called the *Mother* and *Mistress* of all other Churches upon account of it's being older,

older, or planted, before the particular Church of *Jerusalem*; but because it was planted by *St. Peter*, who was an Apostle before the Church of *Jerusalem* was founded; and to whom, Christ committed the Care of feeding, both his *Sheep* and *Lambs*; that is, both the Pastors and Faithful of the universal Church, as, I think, I have already sufficiently proved, in my Answer to your Grace's fifth and eighth Paragraphs.

In the 3<sup>rd</sup>. Paragraph, your Grace says you cannot but take Notice of this Particular Addition in Pope *Pius* his Creed: *I do also without any Doubt, receive and profess all other things which have been deliver'd, defined, and declared, by the sacred Canons, Oecumenical Councils, and especially by the holy Synod of Trent.*

This Doctrine your Grace is pleased to say cou'd not be deliver'd by the Apostles, because these *Canons* and *Councils* have had no Being, until many Years and Ages after their Death. And having spent some Time and Labour in endeavouring to shew, the *Roman* Catholicks cannot be sure the Doctrines contained in the said *Canons* and *Councils* are necessarily to be believed in Order to Salvation, except they had been acquainted with them all; Your Grace asks them, whether they had read over all the said *Canons* and *Councils*, or even the *Acts* of the *Synod of Trent*? With some further pathetick Admonition to them not to swallow down whatever their Church proposes, but first to examin and try it. Lest instead of wholesome and Spiritual Food, they shou'd take that, which is noxious or poisonous.

In the 32d. Your Grace says, the Answer which some of our Perswasion have made hereunto, is: That all the Doctrines contained in these *Canons*, and in the *Acts* of these *Councils*, and particularly of the *Council of Trent*, are either taken out of *Holy Scripture*, and deliver'd down from the Apostles by *Tradition*, that the *Church* is *Infallible* in all her Interpretations of *Scripture*, and also in delivering down her *Traditions*, that is to say, where Faith is concern'd. That since all these Doctrines are declared by an *Infallible Church*, to be of Faith, we think we are bound to receive them without any farther Tryal or Examination. This *Infallibility* your Grace impugn's in the 33d. Paragraph, which begins thus.

“ Whatever Imaginations you may have entertained, touching the *Infallibility* of your Church; yet it is not so much as pretended that each single Christian is Intallible: There is no particular Man amongst you, but what must own that it is possible he may be Mistaken.”

This is, My Lord, the main Point, or rather the only which merits our most serious Consideration. If the Church of Christ be *Infallible* in all her Decisions of Faith, we may safely rely upon her, and not trouble our selves with any farther search into the *Credenda*, or things to be believed. If we follow an *Infallible Guide*, He will without all peradventure lead us to our Journey's End. So that this Point once settled, if Men were disposed for Peace, and wou'd consult their Reason there need be no more Debate about any other of those Points, which have occasion'd  
such



such voluminous Works as the learn'd World is now incumbred with.

+ I shall therefore endeavour to prove, in the first Place, that the Congregation of the Faithful in Communion with the *See of Rome*, is the Church of Christ.

+ Secondly, that this Church is infallible in all her Decisions of Faith. And lastly, answer your Grace's Objections to it.

The *See of Rome* deriving it's Prerogatives from St. *Peter*, who was the Founder of it, and finally fixed his Seat in that City, as all Antiquity proclaims, and to whose Care Christ committed the *Sheep* and the *Lambs*, the Pastors and People of his whole Flock, was made the Head, the Fountain and Center of Unity of the whole Body, of the whole Church of Christ, as I have, I think, sufficiently proved already from the Scripture, and the primitive Fathers. But if the Body be divided or separated from the Head, it is no more a living Body, but a dead Trunk. It is therefore absolutely necessary, that all the Members, that is, all the Faithful shoud be united to this *See*, as to their Head in order to be a living Body. This was so much the Language, and Sense of all Antiquity, of all the Kings and Princes of *Europe*, of all the Prelates and Pastors, that when any Division arose, (*Sede Romana Vacante*) among those who had a Right to chuse a Head, or Bishop for this *See*; and that some had chosen, one, and some another; it never enter'd into the Heart of either King or Prince, Prelate or Pastor to separate from the said Apostolical *See*; and the Reason why they did not all obey the same Man, in the Time of such Division, was,

was, because they were not convinced, that he was legally Chosen for it.

The *See* of Rome was never condemned for *Heresie* by any *General* or *Oecumenical Council*, nor even by any *National* or *Provincial*, till *Photius* the Intruder presumed to draw up Articles against it, whilst the *Lawful Patriarch* of *Constantinople* *St. Ignatius* was alive, and violently expelled his Seat, by him and his Faction, nor did he, even then accuse the *See* of *Rome* of Error or *Heresie* with Respect to the *Real Presence*. *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Mass* or *Prayers for the Dead*; But only for the pretended Error, of the *Procession* of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; the celebrating *Mass* with unleavened Bread, the *Pope's Supremacy*, the Fire of *Purgatory*, and some other trifling pretended Errors. Neither did any *National* or *provincial Council* in the *Western* or *Latin Church* ever condemn it, either before that Time or after till the Days of *Martin Luther* in the Year 1517.

It was *St. Peter* that founded the *Patriarchal Seat* at *Antioch* and his Disciple *St. Mark* the *Evangelist*, whom he sent to *Egypt*, that of *Alexandria*; and we can give no better Reason for the *See* of *Alexandria's* having the Preheminence and Precedence before that of *Antioch*, as it had from the Beginning; than that *St. Mark* was an *Evangelist* and a Disciple, but *Evodius*, the first Bishop of *Antioch*, next after *St. Peter* in that Seat, a Disciple only; And when the Seat of the Empire was by *Constantine*, translated from *Rome* to *Constantinople*, and that the Bishops of that *Metropolis* were ambitious to raise their Seat to the *Patriarchal Dignity*, and

196 *Of the Infallibility of the Church.*

to make it take Place of that of *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, yet they never aspired to a Preheminence over the *See of Rome*, or to take Place of it's Bishop; but were Content to be the second or next after him as appears by the 5th. Canon\* of the first Council of *Constantinople*:

\* Binius  
says the  
3d Canon,

“*Constantinopolitanae Civitatis Episcopum habere oportet Primatus Honorem post Romanum Episcopum, propter quod sit nova Roma.*”  
The Bishop of the City of *Constantinople* ought to have the Honour of Primacy after the Bishop of *Rome*, because it is new *Rome*.

This was confirmed to him by a Decree of the Council of *Chalcedon*. Act, 16. So that the Bishops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* were depressed and cast down from the Rank which they held Time out of Mind. And altho' this Decree was subreptitiously obtained by the Bishop of *Constantinople*, in the Absence of the Pope's Legates, who the next Day, did vigorously oppose it, as did also, *St. Leo* the then Pope or Bishop of *Rome*, in his Letters to *Anatolius* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, to the Empress *Pulcheria*, and to others; and all other Bishops of *Rome* his Successors, to the Days of *Justinianus*; yet, for Peace sake, the succeeding Popes allow'd the Decree, considering that the Bishops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* had *de facto* submitted to it; and that it was only a Matter of Discipline, that did not invade any Prerogative of the *See of Rome*, which the Council wou'd by no Means meddle with, as appears by the Words of the Judges in this 16th. Action. “*Gloriosissimi Judices dixerunt: Ex his quæ Gestæ sunt, & ab unoquoque Deposita, perpendimus ante omnia, Primatum & precipuum Honorem*”



rem, secundum Canones antiquæ Romæ Dei  
 "Amantissimo Archiepiscopo conservari." Thus  
*verbatim* from the Greek, and in English. The  
 most glorious Judges said: *From the things that*  
*have been done, and from what has been deposed*  
*by each one; we determine that above all, the*  
*Primacy and Chief Honour according to the*  
*Canons be conserved for the beloved of God the*  
*Arch-Bishop of old Rome.*

The Emperors of Constantinople did hold and  
 acknowledge the supreme Authority of the See of  
 Rome in the Catholick Church. This we have  
 under their own Hands in two Letters upon the  
 calling of this general Council of Chalcedon.  
 The first written by Valentinianus and Martia-  
 nus, to St. Leo then Bishop of Rome. The  
 second by Martianus alone, to the said Bishop  
 upon the same Subject. In the first, after a short  
 Preamble; they thus address him: We Judge it  
 reasonable, first to acquaint your Holiness, as  
 holding the Principal Episcopacy of divine Faith,  
 by our sacred Letters, inviting and beseeching  
 your Holiness to pray to the eternal Divinity for  
 the Establishment, and Stability of our Empire  
 and that we may have such a Purpose, and De-  
 sire, as that having removed every impious Er-  
 ror by celebrating a Synod by your Authority, †  
 a lasting Peace pure and clear from all Hatred,  
 may be establish'd among all the Bishops of the  
 Catholick Faith

† Let. to  
 Authors.  
 Gr. et. av.  
 ben-toletos.  
 You giv-  
 ing it a  
 Sanction.

In the second, Martianus writes thus to the  
 same St. Leo — Wherefore we have willing-  
 ly, and, as we ought, with a grateful Mind, re-  
 ceived the most reverend Men, whom your Ho-  
 liness has directed to our Piety. It remains that  
 if it shall please your Holiness to come to these

Parts and celebrate a Synod; vouchsafe to do it for the Love of Religion: For your Holiness will satisfy our Desires, and decree the Things that are profitable to sacred Religion. But if it be burthensome to you to come to these Parts, Let your Holiness make it known to us, that our sacred Letters, may be sent unto all the East, and into Thracia and Illyricum, that all the holy Bishops may meet at a certain determinate Place, where it shall please us, that we may settle things that are profitable to the Peace of the Christian Religion, and to the Catholick Faith, as your Holiness shall define according to the Ecclesiastical Canons.

These Letters together with another from the Empress *Pulcheria* to *St. Leo* upon the same Subject, are to be seen, both in *Greek* and *Latin*, in the Beginning of the *Acts* of the Council of *Chalcedon*, Edit. *Sever. Bini*.

It was a Prerogative of the *See* of *Rome* to receive the Appeals of all the Bishops in the Christian World, which is an evident Sign of Jurisdiction and Power; since all Appeals are from an inferior to a superior Tribunal. This the General Council of *Sardica*, held Anno Dom. 347. plainly shews, in the 5th. Canon, Edit. *Bini*. The Canons of this Council, being in the Council it self reduced to Writing, both in *Greek* and *Latin*. I shall transcribe the *Latin*; as the more easy to be published. " *Hoc*  
 " *fusus Episcopus dixit: Placuit, ut si quis Epis-*  
 " *copus delatus fuerit, & Congregati ejusdem*  
 " *Regionis Episcopi eum Gradu moverint, &*  
 " *veluti appellans confugerit ad Beatissimum*  
 " *Romanae Ecclesiae Episcopum, & velit ipsum*  
 " *audire, & justum esse existimaverit ejus Rei*  
 " *Examinationem renovari; Co-episcopis scri-*  
 " *boxe*

"bere dignabitur, qui sunt propinqui Provin-  
 "cia, ut ipsi diligenter & accuratè singula per  
 "scrutentur, & ex Veritatis Fide de Re Sen-  
 "tentiam ferant. Si quis autem postulet suum  
 "Negotium rursus audiri; & ad suam suppli-  
 "cationem, *Romanorum* Episcopum judicare vi-  
 "sum fuerit, ut a proprio Latere *Presbyteros*  
 "mittat; erit in Potestate ipsius quodcunque  
 "rectè habere probaverit. Et si decreverit o-  
 "portere eos mitti, qui cum Episcopis sint judi-  
 "caturi habentes Authoritatem ejus, a quo missi  
 "sunt; et hoc ponendum est. Si autem suffi-  
 "cere putaverit ad Rei Cognitionem & Epil-  
 "copi Sententiam, faciet quod prudentissimo  
 "ejus Consilio rectè habere videbitur. Respon-  
 "derunt Episcopi: Quæ dicta sunt, placue-  
 "runt." *Hosius the Bishop said: It is our Plea-*  
*sure, that if an Information be given against any*  
*Bishop, and that the Bishops of the same Coun-*  
*try assembled together depose him, and that he, by*  
*way of Appeal, shall fly to the most blessed Bi-*  
*shop of the Church of Rome. If the same is wil-*  
*ling to hear him, and that he thinks it just to re-*  
*new the Examination of his Cause; Let him*  
*vouchsafe to write to his Brethren the Bishops,*  
*who are of the neighbouring Province, that they*  
*may diligently and accurately dive into every*  
*particular, and give Sentence according to the*  
*Merits of the Cause. But if any should demand*  
*his Cause to be heard over again, and that the*  
*Bishop of Rome shou'd, at his Prayer, judge it*  
*advisable to send Presbyters from his own side;*  
*it will be in his Power to do whatsoever he shall*  
*think just. And if he Judges that such ought to*  
*be sent, as may Judge with the Bishops having*  
*his Authority, by whom they are sent. This also*



## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

*is to be decreed. But if he shall judge enough to have been done for the Cognizance of the Cause, and the Sentence pronounced against the Bishop. Let him do what shall seem, in his prudent Counsel, to be most expedient. The Bishops answer'd: The Things that are said, please us.*

*By way of Appeal, shall fly to the most Blessed Bishop of the Church of Rome. There lay then an Appeal from the Sentence of any National or Provincial Council to the Bishop of Rome, in the Opinion of the Fathers of this General Council. They did then acknowledge the Jurisdiction and Authority, of the See of Rome over all the Bishops of the World. In consequence of this Jurisdiction, St. Athanasius Patriarch of Alexandria, who was the greatest Bishop in the Christian World, next after the Bishop of Rome; and Paulus Bishop of Constantinople, did in some Years before, appeal to Julius Bishop of Rome, from the unjust Sentence of the Arian Bishops, who deposed them both; so did St. Chrysostom, and Theodoretus in some Years after, and hundreds of others in every Age, as well Eastern as Western Bishops.*

*The Church of Christ was from the Beginning of Christianity, divided, in Appellation and Name, but not in Faith, into the Eastern and Western Churches. The two pernicious Heresies, of Nestorius and Eutyches distracted the Eastern Church, and drew after them an infinite Number of People, of the vast Patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria. And God in his Wrath, suffer'd an handful of Barbarous Saracens, to grow to such Power and Strength, as to subdue in a few Years all these flourishing,*  
great

great and populous Kingdoms, and to reduce the Christians, both *Catholicks* and *Hereticks* to the Milery, and servitude under which they groan to this very Day. The *Greek Church* still kept the Faith, and their Obedience to the *See of Rome*, till the Days of *Photius*, in the Ninth Century, who as I observ'd before, drew up Articies against the *See of Rome*. And tho' this *Intruder* was condemned by the *Pope's* Legates and by a Council of *Greek Bishops* held at *Constantinople*, and banished by the Emperor *Basilus*, and had by Arts and Tricks deceived the said Emperor, so as to prevail upon him to restore him again, and to banish the lawful Patriarch *St. Ignatius*; yet the *Greek Church* did not thoroughly break Communion with the *See of Rome* till about the Middle of the Eleventh Century: And even then did very often from Time to Time desire to be reunited to it; as all the Ecclesiastical Historians both of the *Greek* and *Latin Churches* testifie. Nor did all the *Eastern Catholicks* join with *Photius* and his Adherents in the *Schism*; For many of them have been at all times since, and are to this Day in Communion with the *Latin Church*.

The *Greek Church* did in a Solemn Manner earnestly desire to be united to the *Latin* in the 13th. Century. when the second General Council of *Lyons* was called, in the Year 1274. Which, as many Historians affirm, was the thirteenth Time they did the same thing, since *Photius* his *Schism*, and as often relapsed. To this Council *Michael Paleologus* the Emperor of *Constantinople* and the *Greek Church* sent a splendid Embassy, instructed with two Authentick Letters; one from the Emperor, and the other

## 202 Of the Infallibility of the Church.

other from the *Greek* Bishops. The Emperor's Letter was in *Greek* and *Latin*, and the Emperor and his Son *Andronicus* swore upon the holy Gospels in the presence of the Pope's Legates, whom he had sent to *Constantinople* to that purpose, that they would Religiously observe and believe the Things contained in the said Letter. The *Latin* carries this Title. \*

\* See

Sponda-

mus ad

Annum,

1274. Lu-

cas Wa-

dingus.

Annal.

Minor.

" **SANCTISSIMO ET BEATISSIMO**

" primo et summo Pontifici, Apostolicæ sedis

" venerabili *Papæ*, & communi Patri omnium

" Christianorum, & venerabili Patri Imperij

" nostri Domino **GREGORIO**, *Michael* in

" Christo Deo fidelis *Imperator, et Moderator,*

" *Romaorum, Ducas, Angelus, Commenus,*

" *Palæologus, & Spiritualis Filius* magnæ ve-

" stræ Sanctitatis, convenientem Honorem &

" Reverentiam cum sincera & pura Affectione,

" et Orationum Postulatione." **TO THE**

**MOST HOLY AND MOST BLESSED,**

*first and chief Pontiff, the venerable Pope of the Apostolick SEE, the common Father of all the Christians, and the venerable Father of our Empire, the Lord GREGORY, Michael the Faithful Emperor, in Christ and God, and Moderator of the Romans, Ducas, Angelus, Commenus, Palæologus, and Spiritual Son of your great Holiness, convenient Honour and Reverence with sincere and pure Affection, and the Desire of your Prayers.*

In this Letter is inserted the *Nicene Creed* with the Addition of the Word *Filioque*; as also the belief of *Seven Sacraments*, and of *Transubstantiation*, together with a Profession of the Pope's being the Supreme Pastor of all the Church of God. But he (the Emperor) begs the Pope to permit (in condescension to the Weakness



Weakness of some *Greeks*) the Creed to be read and sung in their Churches, as it was before the *Schism*; and to allow of their ancient Rites and Ceremonies, which are not contrary to the *Roman Faith*, or Decrees of general Councils.

The Letter of the *Greek Bishops* is subscribed by thirty Eight, of which Number, there were six and twenty *Metropolitans*, who all in their own Names, and in the Name of all their *suffragan Bishops*; promise, and profess to hold and maintain all and singular the Things contained and expressed in their Emperor's Letter; and add with all, how sorry they were, they cou'd not induce *Joseph* the then *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* to join with them in this Profession; but that, if he cou'd not be prevail'd upon to embrace this Union and Reconciliation with the *See of Rome*, they wou'd depose him; as they did in effect the Year following, and placed in his Throne *Joannes Beccus*, Great *Logothete* and *Cartophylax* of the Church of *Constantinople*, who himself was one of the Emperor's Ambassadors at this Council, and in the 4th. Session thereof, in the Presence of the whole Council, swore upon the Gospels, in his own Name, and in the Name of the Emperor to persevere in this Faith, and Profession to his last Breath.

'Tis true, the Generality of the *Greeks* did not long continue in this good Resolution; for the Faction and Party of *Josephus* in a few Years got the upper Hand, and persecuted to Death such as adhered to the Union, by the help of their Emperors, who were in those Days, and in many Years before and after, streightned on every side, and distressed by the *Turks* and Sa-

*razens*, so as to be willing to side with, and Countenance either side as they judged them to be the most prevailing. Thus did these unfortunate *Greeks* and their Emperors, as if God had deliver'd them over to a reprobate Sense, play fast and loose, with the *Popes*, who in Charity and pure Pity to their Miserable State, spared no Cost nor Pains, and condescended to go all Lengths, that were consistent with the Faith of Christ, to unite effectually to the Head, that once flourishing Member of Christ's Mystical Body. And thus did they bring down the Vengeance of Heaven upon their own Heads, (as the unfortunate Christians of the *Orient* and *Egypt* had done before, by their *Heresie* and *Obstinacy*) and filled up the Measure of their Iniquity, by their perfidious Back-sliding from the Promise and Faith, which both Emperor and Bishops solemnly plighted, and gave under their Hands in the Council of *Florence* in the Year 1439, before God and his Angels; and before so August an Assembly of *Pope*, Cardinals, Prelates, Doctors and People: For which God gave them up to the Instruments of his Wrath the *Turks*, who in a few Years after, took their Capital City *Constantinople*, slew their Emperor, Son to him that was in *Florence*, extinguished his Name and Family, and reduced the *Greek Church* to that miserable Servitude and Bondage under which it groans to this very Day.

To this Council of *Florence*, for by that Name it always went, (Tho' some *Sessions* had been held at *Ferrara*;) because the main Business was there transacted; came the *Greek Emperor* himself *Joanes Paleologus*, the Patriarch  
of

of *Constantinople*, the Deputies of the *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*. Sixteen *Metropolitans* or *Arch-Bishops*. And ten *Abbots* and *Dignitaries*, and a great many other *Clergy-Men* of an *Inferior Rank*.

This was the most Famous Assembly that ever was seen in *Europe*. Here was displayed all the Art of *Rhetorick*, all the Subtility of *Logic*, and all the Erudition and Knowledge of the *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, that was to be expected from Men of the greatest Abilities. Here the *Greeks* made it appear, they had not forgot the *Oratory* and *Eloquence* they were once so much celebrated for, and convinced the *World*, that it was not so much to please their *Emperor* they undertook the *Dispute*, as to find out the *Truth* of the *Matters* in *Debate*; as may be seen by their learned *ex tempore* *Discourses*, recorded in the *Acts* of this *Council*. On the other Hand, the *Romans* were no way short of them, in any of these Perfections. They had *Truth*, *Scripture*, and the *Fathers* on their Side; and they wanted neither *Art* or *Eloquence* to convince the *Greeks* of their *Errors*. In short, after a long *Debate*, in a *Regular* and *Methodical* *Dispute*, which lasted some *Months*, they bore them down by the *Force* of *Argument* and *Dint* of *Reason*, so as to silence them, and bring them all over to their side, except *Marcus Ephesinus*; and to acknowledge under their Hands, and Profess to believe, (as appears by the *Letters* of *Union*.) " That the *Holy Ghost*  
" proceeds from the *Father* and the *Son*, that  
" the *Sacrament* of the *Altar* may be validly  
" and lawfully made of either *Leaven* or un-  
" leavened *Bread*, according to the *Rites* of  
" each



“ each Church. That the Souls of the Faithful,  
 “ who die Penitent, with the Love of God, and  
 “ have not by worthy Fruits of Penance, satisfi-  
 “ fied God’s Justice, are purged in *Purgatory*,  
 “ and that in order to be relieved from thence,  
 “ the suffrages of the Faithful that are alive,  
 “ the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, the Prayers, the  
 “ Alms, and other pious Offices of the Living,  
 “ do very much avail; That the Souls of those  
 “ who have contracted no Sin; as also the Souls  
 “ of those who have been purged of their Sins as  
 “ aforesaid, go strait to Heaven, and enjoy the  
 “ beatifick Vision; That the Souls of those, who  
 “ die in actual Mortal Sin, or in original Sin,  
 “ go strait to Hell, but are differently punished;  
 “ That the *Roman Pontiff* has the *Primacy* in  
 “ all the Christian World, is the Successor of St.  
 “ *Peter* Vicar of Christ, and Head of all the  
 “ Church. That the Patriarch of *Constantino-*  
 “ *ple* is to hold the second Place after the *Pope*,  
 “ the Patriarch of *Alexandria* the third, the  
 “ Patriarch of *Antioch* the fourth, and the Pa-  
 “ triarch of *Jerusalem* the fifth.”

This is the Subtance of the Letters of *Union*,  
 perfected in the Council of *Florence* as may be  
 seen more at large in it’s *Acts*; by which your  
 Grace may see, there was no Mention made of  
*Transubstantiation*, *Real Presence*, no Dispute  
 about the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, *Invocation* of  
*Saints*, *Indulgences*, or *Prayers* for the *Dead*;  
 which surely wou’d have been all agitated in this  
 famous Dispute, had there been any Difference  
 between the *Greeks* and the *Latins* upon these  
 Heads.

This *Union* was signed by the Emperor *Pa-*  
*leologus*, by all the *Metropolitans*, *Bishops*, *Pre-*  
*lates*,

lates and Dignitaries that attended him from Greece, except *Marcus Ephesinus*; and the venerable good Father *Joseph* Lord Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who died some Days before the Articles of the Union were drawn up. But his Consent to, and Approbation of them all was found in his Closet written with his own Hand; as the *Acts* of the Council declare in these Words: "*Joseph* Miseratione Divina *Constantinopolis*, & novæ *Romæ* Archiepiscopus ac "*Oecumenicus* Patriarcha. Quoniam ad extremum Vitæ meæ perveni, idcirco pro meo "*Munere* dilectis Filijs Benignitate Dei meam "*sententiam* his Litteris palam Facio. Nam "*quæ* Domini *Jesu Christi* Catholica & Apostolica Ecclesia *Romæ* veteris sentiat ac celebret; "*omnia* me quoque sentire, credereque profiteor, ac ipsis plurimum acquiesco. Beatissimum "*autem* Patrum Patrem summum Pontificem, "*Romæque* Veteris *Papam* Domini nostri *Jesu* "*Christi* Vicarium esse concedere, atque Animarum *Purgatorium* esse non inficio. Datum "*Florentiæ* Octava Mensis Junij 1439" I *Joseph* by the Mercy of God Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople* new *Rome*, and *Oecumenical* Patriarch. For as much as I am come to the last Period of my Life. I do therefore, in discharge of my Duty publish by these Letters my Sentence to my beloved Sons in God. For the Things which the Catholick and Apostolick Church of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, of old *Rome* doth think and Practice, all the same I also profess to think and believe, and altogether agree with them. And the most holy Father of Fathers, the chief Pontiff, and Pope of old *Rome*, I grant to be the Vicar of *Jesus Christ*, and deny  
not

## 208 *Of the Infallibility of the Church.*

*not that there is a Purgatory of Souls. Given, at Florence, the Eight Day of the Month of June 1439.*

From the *Acts* of this Council we may, My Lord, borrow Matter enough for our most serious Consideration. Here are the three *Patriarchs* of the *East*, in conjunction with the *Greek Patriarch*, with so many *Metropolitans*, *Bishops*, *Prelates*, and *Dignitaries* of the *Eastern Countries*, concurring with the *Patriarch* of the *West* with the *Pope*, and with all the *Primates*, *Metropolitans*, *Arch-Bishops*, *Bishops*, *Universities*, *Doctors*, *Religious-Houses*, and *Communities* of all *Europe*, and agreeing in the same Faith, even in the very Points which the *Greeks*, had for many Ages before, sometimes denied, and sometimes professed.

Here is as full a Representative of the Church of Christ, as any Man can in Reason require, holding the same Faith, believing the same Faith, and professing the same Faith. Surely then the Professors of this Faith did necessarily, in those Days, make up the whole Catholick Church; or there was no such Thing as Catholick Faith, or Catholick Church on Earth. And if so then, it is evident the Professors of the same Faith in our Days, must make up the same whole Catholick Church, since they neither added the least *lot* to it, nor took away the least Tittle from it, to this very Day. And tho' the Generality of the *Greek Bishops* that were not in this Council, and even some of those who had signed the *Union*, upon their Return, were spirited up by the Fury and Rage of *Marcus Ephesinus*, to make a *Schism* and Rupture from all the rest of the *Orthodox Believers*,  
without



without any Cause or Provocation, for which Perfidy they fill'd up the Measure of their Iniquity, were delivered into the Hands of *Turks* and *Barbarians*, and do groan under the Tyranny and Slavery of these *Infidels* to this very Day; yet for as much as neither *Hereticks* nor *Schismatics* are, nor can be Members of the Church of Christ, while they persist in their *Heresy* or *Schism*; and that all those, who joined with the said *Marcus* in his Subtraction from so great, and so lawfull an Authority, and in denying the Points of Faith defined and decreed by the same, are such: 't is evident that all the rest, who profess t<sup>r</sup>s Faith, and continue in the Communion of the *See of Rome*, make up the whole Catholick Church of Christ. Now that this Catholick Church is infallible in determining Matters of Faith, I shall endeavour to shew, in the *second Place*.

I had said before, that to follow an *Infallible Guide*, is the surest Way to come to our Journey's End; or (which is the same thing) to walk in the Path which the Catholick Church chalks out for us, is the only sure Way to arrive at the Kingdom of Heaven. To prove, then that the Congregation of the Faithful, which was in Communion with the *See of Rome*, at the Time of the Council of *Florence*; and by Consequence the Congregation of the Faithful now in Communion with it, since they both hold the same Faith without any Addition or Diminution; has often repeated Promises of the Divine Assistance from the Mouth of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, to guide it into all Truth; That is, that the Chief Pastors of the said Congregation, whether assembled together in a ge-  
O
neral

neral Council, to decide concerning any Point of Faith controverted, or separately agreeing in such Decision, have these promises of the Assistance of the Holy Ghost to guide them into all Truth, as well with Respect to such Point, as to all other Points which they hold and profess to be of divine Faith. To prove, I say, that this Congregation, this Church, this *Ecclesia docens*, hath such Promises, from the Mouth of Christ himself, (who is faithful and able to perform what he promiseth) and by Consequence is Infallible in such Decisions, I shall produce the said promises in the Order of Time, as they were given.

Christ's first Promise of protecting his Church against all the Powers of Darkness was addressed to St. Peter, as a Reward of that noble Profession of his Divinity, *which neither Flesh nor Blood, but the Father which is in Heaven had revealed unto him.* Matth. 16. 17. His other Promises were made at the last Supper, in that Sermon, which is, as it were, his last Will and Testament; every Word whereof seems to be the overflowing of a Heart filled with Concern for his beloved Spouse. 'Twas then that Christ unbosom'd himself to his Apostles, as a Friend or Father, comforted them in their Affliction for his approaching Departure, and as a pledge of his unalterable Love to his Church, bequeathed to them *the Spirit of Truth*, to be her Guide and Teacher to the World's End, All which he ratified again, a few Moments before his Ascension into Heaven, when he gave his Apostles their Commission *to Teach and Baptize all Nations*, and encouraged them to undertake this Charge with a Promise of his perpetual Assistance

from  
Manning  
that way

## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

[211]

Assistance: Lo I am with you alway even unto the End of the World. Matth. 28. 20.

The Occasion of this *first* Promise is very remarkable. St. Peter's Name till then was *Simon Barjona*. But God having preordained him to be the Chief Pillar of his Church, illustrated his Understanding in a particular Manner with a distinct Faith of the Divinity of Christ, whereof he made his solemn Profession: *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*, Matth. 16. V. 16. Hereupon *Jesus Christ* dignified him with a Title suitable to the Firmness of his Faith, and to the eminent Station he was to hold, and gave him the Name of *Cephas* or *Peter*; both which signify a *Rock*. And then, as a further Mark of Distinction, he thus addressed to him the above-said Promise: *Thou art Peter (that is a Rock) and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* Matth. 16. 18. If this be not a Proof of an Infallible Church, I own I am at a Loss to find Words clear and strong enough to express it. What other meaning can we give to the Words of Christ that will bear any Connection with their obvious and natural Signification?

That they contain a promise is plain: That the promise which they contain is made to the Church is no less plain: and since all God's Promises have a Relation to some Favour, it remains only to consider what this Favour is.

First then, Christ promises to build his Church upon a Rock. What does this mean? Is it probable Christ, who fore-saw every thing that was to happen, would have told St. Peter that his Church shou'd be built upon a Rock, if he had foreseen it's future Fall? Had he no Design, that



## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

that the *Rock* upon which his Church was to be built, shou'd be a firm and lasting Foundation to it? Or did he act by chance, and without End, or Design? But Christ himself has answer'd all these Questions in the following Words. *I will liken him unto a Wise Man, who built his House upon a Rock; and the Rain descended and the Floods came, and the Winds blew, and beat upon that House, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a Rock.* *Math. 7. 24. 25.* Whence it is plain that Christ by promising, that his Church shou'd be built upon a *Rock*, intended to assure us, that it's Foundation shou'd be so strong, so deeply laid, that it shou'd stand in spite of all Storms, Oppositions, or any Efforts whatsoever to make it fall. And therefore to prevent the very possibility of all but wilful Mistakes, in the *second Part* of the promise, he explains himself, and declares positively, *that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* which Words contain two things. *First*, they imply a general Prediction of what shou'd happen to the Church, from the Efforts and Malice of her Enemies, who shou'd oppose or endeavour to corrupt her holy Doctrine. And *secondly*, a positive Assurance, that all their Strength and Malice, which our Saviour calls *the Gates of Hell*, shall never prevail against her.

*from do* The Prediction has been fully verified. The *Jews*, the professed Enemies of Christ, were the first Champions of *Satan*, who declared themselves openly, and made many furious Assaults upon His Church. They were soon followed by several Apostate Christians, as the *Ebionites*, the *Nicaites*, the *Cerinthians*, and many others, who conspired together to corrupt the Purity

of her Doctrine. And the ten Bloody Persecutions raised by the Heathen-Emperors in the three first Centuries, aim'd at nothing less than to extirpate the Christian-Religion, and destroy the Church, Root and Branch.

When these Storms ceased, and the Church was deliver'd from foreign Enemies, her own Bowels rose up against her in so violent a Manner, as seem'd to threaten her utter Ruin: *Arius*, and his Followers, supported by the Secular Power of Christian-Emperors, and a great Number of Apostate-Bishops, made a furious War upon her for many Years together. All the Means that Artifice or Malice cou'd suggest, were employed to undermine the very Foundations of Religion. The most Zealous Catholick Bishops, were either Murder'd, or imprison'd, or sent into Banishment; so that the Wolves being let in among the Flock, every thing seem'd to tend to the utter Extirpation of the Catholick Faith, which gave Occasion to *St Jerome* to say: *Ingemuit Mundus et miratus est se Arianum esse*. This was the State of the Church in those turbulent Times, and her Condition has in some Measure been the same, from Time to Time, when ever the Devil and his Ministers made any new Attempt upon the Purity of her Faith: as has happen'd almost in every Age from the very Infancy of the Church to this Time downwards.

So, here we see the Powers of Hell have always been aimed against the Church, and the *Prediction*, imply'd in the fore mention'd Text, has been fully verified. But have we not as good Security for the Effects of Christ's *Promises*, as for the *Event* of his Predictions? Is he

## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

he not equally *Infallible*, when he promises Blessings, as when he foretells Calamities and Disasters? There can be no doubt of it. And therefore, tho' the Powers of *Darkness* will never cease to make War upon the Church, their Efforts will always be as vain as the *Winds and Rain against the House, that is built upon a Rock*. And as her Faith has stood the shock, both against the united Force of *Jews and Pagans*, and the Deceitful Reasonings of *Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Donatists, Pelagians*, and others; so will it remain immovable and incorruptible to the World's End. And this is so manifest a Truth, that to deny it, we must either interpret the *Scriptures* backwards, or give our *Saviour* flatly the Lie. For, if Words retain their usual Signification, we cannot charge the Church of *Christ* with Error, even against any one single Article of Faith, but we must draw this impious Consequence from it, that He was either ignorant of the Event of his Promise, or unfaithful to it; and that after having in so solemn a Manner, engaged his Sacred Word to *St. Peter*, that *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against his Church*, He has nevertheless deliver'd her up to the Power of *Satan*, to be destroyed by him.

*Manning* This Consequence will appear undeniable, if we consider the two following Truths, viz. 1<sup>o</sup>. That Faith is essential to the Constitution of the Church; and 2<sup>o</sup>. That *Heresy destroys Faith*. For it plainly follows hence, that if the whole Church falls into *Heresy*, she is without Faith, and is no more the Church she was before, than a Man can continue to be a Man without a Soul. The Church of *Christ* (as I think,



think, I have already proved) can only be that, which believes wholly and intirely the Doctrine that was taught by *Christ*, and deliver'd to her by the *Apostles*. If therefore she ever renounced any Part of that Doctrine, does it not follow, that she then turn'd Apostate? That she ceased from that Moment, to be the *Chaste Spouse of Christ*? That the *Gates of Hell* prevailed against her? And that, by consequence, our *Saviour*, in permitting that to happen, which He promised shoud not happen, was unfaithful to his Word.

Again, *Christ* either foresaw, that the *Gates of Hell* should not prevail against his Church, or he foresaw it not. If not, then He promised he knew not what: But if he did foresee it, then (since his Foresight was Infallible in every thing) the Event must answer it infallibly; and so it must be infallibly true, that the *Gates of Hell* never prevailed, nor ever will prevail against his Church.

In a Word, I take this to be a Demonstration: The *Gates of Hell* (according to *Christ's* own Words) will never prevail against his Church; but if she falls into any Error against Faith, the *Gates of Hell* prevail against her: Therefore she cannot fall into any Error against Faith: Therefore she is infallible in all Matters of Faith.

If it be ask'd, (as your Grace is pleas'd to do) how any Congregation or Society of Men can be infallible, since all Men (as the *Psalmist* says) are Liars, that is, subject to Errors? I answer, that all Men of themselves are subject to Errors, even in the most ordinary Things; but much more in Matters of Faith, which are

above human Reason : And therefore if the *Infallibility* of the Church was to depend upon the Judgment, Wit, or learning of Men, it would have but a very weak Foundation, and would be like *the House of the Foolish Man built upon the Sand, which was overthrown by the Winds and Floods that beat upon it, Matth. 7. 26.* But our Saviour was not this foolish Man : He did not tell St. Peter that his Church should be built upon the Sand, but that it should be built upon a Rock, and that therefore *the Gates of Hell should not prevail against it ;* and we cannot doubt but he has made good his Words, and has found Means to do it, notwithstanding the natural Weakness and *Fallibility* of the Members, whereof she was to be composed.

The Means then, by which this great Work was to be brought about, have no less their Warrant and Security from the Word of God, and Promises of Christ, than the thing it self. If this be clearly made out, the Evidence will be so full, as to leave no Room for any further serious Dispute. We grant then, that no human Industry, Wit or Learning are sufficient to secure the Church from falling into Error, and that nothing can render her *Infallible* but the Assistance and Direction of an *Infallible Guide*. But Christ has taken Care to provide such a Guide for his Church ; a *Guide* of infinite Wisdom, and has promised that this *Guide* shall lead her into all Truth, and continue with her to the End of the World. All which stand recorded in the Gospels, in the most plain and express Terms,

Our Saviour's Words spoken to his Apostles, and recorded by St. John in his 14th. Chap. 16th.

Verse.

*Verse.* Are these : I will ask my Father, and he will send you another Comforter to abide with you for ever. And soon after he informs them, who this Comforter is to be, and to what End his Father will send him : The Comforter (says Christ) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my Name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your Remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. Verse 26. This promise is again repeated in the 16th. Chapter, which contains a Continuation of the same Discourse. I have yet many things to say unto you, but you cannot hear them now : However when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will lead you into all Truth. Verse 13.

Here we have the Means, by which the Church of Christ is to be for ever protected against the Gates of Hell, clearly and distinctly set down, viz. The perpetual Assistance of the divine Spirit teaching the Church, and leading her into all Truth ; Nay and these Means secured to her by him, to whom all Power is given in Heaven and Earth. And who can suspect that Christ shou'd abandon his Church and suffer her to become a Prey to her Enemies after the sacred Engagement of so many Promises to the Contrary ?

But if it be objected, that all the foremention'd Texts contain no more than a Promise of the visible Descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, which was accomplished ten Days after Christ's Ascension into Heaven. I answer, that this cannot be. For tho' that be a Part of the Promise, it is not the whole. And therefore as that Part was fully performed, we cannot doubt but the other Part will be so too, That



## 218 Of the Infallibility of the Church.

That it is not the whole Promise, is manifest : Because one part of it says expressly, that the *Comforter* or *Holy Ghost* shall abide with them *for ever* ; which tho' address'd to the Apostles, as the whole Sermon at our Saviour's last Supper was, yet like many other Truths contained in it, cou'd not regard their Persons alone, for they were not to live *for ever* ; but comprehended likewise all those who were to succeed them in after Ages. And that this was the Intent of our Saviour's Promise appears clearly from his last Words before his *Ascension*, recorded by St. *Matth.* Chap. 28. vv. 19. 20. *All Power* (says Christ) *is given unto me in Heaven and Earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c. And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World.* For in what Manner was Christ to be alway with them, since he was then upon the Point of withdrawing from them his visible Presence ? 'Twas doubtless by the invisible Grace, Assistance and Protection of the divine Spirit. And since this is promised to continue *even unto the End of the World*, it explains the former Words *for ever* and renders it manifest that the foremention'd Texts are not to be limited to the Apostles, but that the Church throughout all Ages has a Title to the Promise they contain.

Which Truth is yet further confirmed from the End or Motive, for which the Promise was made. Now this was no other, than that the Church shou'd be *guided into all Truth*. And has not the Church stood in need of being guided into all Truth in every Age, as much as in the Time of the Apostles ? Surely rather more. Because the further we are removed from the Source of any Truth,

Truth, which depends upon Authority more than natural Reason, the harder it is to trace our Way back to it. And therefore if the divine Assistance was necessary *to guide the Church* into all Truth, even in those happy Times, when the Apostles themselves who have been taught in the School of Christ, instructed her either by Word of Mouth, or by their Writings; it cannot be denied, but this assistance has been at least full as needful to Her in after Ages, when the Words and Writings of the Apostles by the distance of Time could not avoid having the Fate of other Authors, of being liable to Misinterpretations, false Glosses, Changes and Corruptions; unless the same infallible Guide which preserved the Church from Error in her Infancy, had continued ever since to conduct her in the Paths of Truth.

What Reason then, is there to think, that Christ shou'd withdraw his divine Spirit from the Church, at a Time, when his Assistance was most needful to her? Or that the Engagement of an *unlimited* and *unconditional* Promise shou'd ever become void, whilst the sole *End* and *Motive* of it was not only subsisting, but rather more pressingly calling upon it, than at first. Or must we accuse Christ of *Inconstancy*, and say he was less tender of his Church in process of Time, than when he *espoused* her first, and seal'd the Contract with his precious Blood? If so, then St. Paul made Choice of a very improper Pattern to set before the *Ephesian* Husbands, in exhorting them to *love their Wives as Christ loved his Church*, Eph. 5. V. 25. But St. Paul remember'd these Words of *Hosea*; *I will espouse thee to me for ever. I will espouse thee*

*thee to me in Faith.* Hos. 2. VV. 19. 20.  
And therefore hazarded nothing in recommending the Love of Christ to his Church, as a perfect Pattern of a constant and unchangeable Love; of which it wou'd come very short, if he shou'd ever leave her to be corrupted, and adulterated with false Doctrine.

But St. *Paul* foresaw no such Change. He doubted not but Christ wou'd be *for ever* faithful to his Spouse; and as the most effectual Pledge of his Love, *present her to himself without spot or Wrinkle, or any such thing.* Eph. 5. V. 27. He therefore calls the Church *the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, 1. Tim. 3. V. 15. which wou'd be flatly false, if she were capable of teaching any thing contrary to God's revealed Word. For the same Reason, Christ himself has declared, that *he, who will not hear the Church, shall be reputed as a Heathen and a Publican.* Matth. 18. V. 17. And can any Man deserve these infamous Characters for not hearing a Church that shall teach false Doctrine? Finally, for the same Reason Christ has pronounced, that *he who believes shall be saved, and he who believes not shall be damn'd.* Mark. 16. V. 16. But what is it we are bound to believe under this Pain of being damn'd? 'Tis doubtless the Doctrine of that Church, which Christ establish'd on Earth: For there can be no other true one. And is it possible, that Christ shou'd oblige Mankind under Pain of Damnation to believe a Church, which he foresaw wou'd seduce them in Proccess of Time? Shall a Man be damn'd for not beleiving a *Seducer*?

This implies a Contradiction to another Part of Christ's own Doctrine, who expressly commands



## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

221

mands us to beware of false Prophets, Matth. 7. 15. For if we are bound to beware of them, and yet the Church her self may turn false Prophet, and mislead us; then we are both commanded to beware of her; and at the same Time threaten'd with eternal Damnation if we refuse to believe her. This is surely strange Stuff, and a glaring Contradiction. But Christ in commanding us to beware of false Prophets, has set a Mark of Infamy upon all Broachers of new Doctrine, to distinguish them from his Church, which therefore he commands us to believe under pain of Damnation; and by laying this Command upon us, he shew'd plainly that it was his Intention to establish an Infallible Church upon Earth: A Church that shou'd be a safe and unerring Guide to those who followed her Doctrine. Finally a Church, that shou'd be taught and guided by the Spirit of Truth even unto the End of the World.

Thus we see the many Sacred Testimonies, upon which the Belief of an Infallible Church is founded. I know very well, that no Text of holy Scripture is so clear, but Persons of Wit may find Interpretations to perplex it, or set it in a false Light. The true Sense of it may be eluded by precarious Distinctions, or perverted by false Glosses; as scarce any Man can express himself so clearly, but Wit and Prejudice may put a Misconstruction upon his Words. But the Question is not, whether the Texts I have produced, may, with some Pain and Study, be interpreted otherwise, than the Roman Catholick Church has always understood them, but whether in their natural, obvious, and literal Sense, they do not lead an unbiass'd Reader to the

Idea

## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

*Idea and Belief of an Infallible Church?* This certainly is a point which deserves to be taken seriously into Consideration, by all sincere Lovers of Truth.

Let us then examine a little what the primitive General-Councils, and the primitive Fathers thought of this Matter. General-Councils, have been always look'd upon to be the *Ecclesia Docens*, to be the Representatives of the whole Church of *Christ*. of these we have the *Acts* of the four first, viz. Of the Councils of *Nice*, of *Constantinople*, of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*. The first was held in the Year 325. and the last in 451. These Councils did believe themselves to have a full and ample Authority, to pronounce Sentence against *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, *Eryches*, and *Dioscorus*, and to condemn them as *Hereticks*, from which Sentence they, and all the *Catholic Church* for many Ages, did believe there was no Appeal, no Redress. They believed themselves to be intitled to pronounce after the Model of the *Apostles* in the Council of *Jerusalem*: It seemed Good to the Holy Ghost and to us. *Acts* 15. 28. They did then believe, they were assisted by the Holy Ghost, in giving their Sentence, and by consequence, that they were Infallible. This Testimony *St. Gregory the Great* gives of them, in the End of his long and learned Letter to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and to the three Patriarchs of the Eastern Churches, *Epistola* 24. *Indict.* 9. "Sicut (says he) Sancti  
"Evangelij quatuor Libros, sic quatuor Concilia  
"suscipere & venerari me fateor. *Nicanum*  
"scilicet, in quo perversum *Arij* Dogma de-  
"struitur, *Constantinopolitanum* quoque, in quo  
"Eunomij

## Of the Infallibility of the Church. 221

" Eunomij & Macedonij Error convincitur.  
 " Ephesinum etiam primum, in quo Nestorij Im-  
 " pietas judicatur. *Calcedonense* verò in quo  
 " Eutychetis, Dioscorique Pravitas reprobatur  
 " tota Devotione complector." *As I reverence*  
*the four Books of the Gospel, so I do profess to re-*  
*ceive and reverence the four Councils, viz. The*  
*Nicean in which the perverse Doctrine of Arius*  
*is destroyed, the Constantinopolitan also, in which*  
*the Error of Eunomius and Macedonius is con-*  
*victed. In like Manner the first Council of Ephe-*  
*sus, in which the Impiety of Nestorius is adjudged.*  
*Finally the Council of Chalcedon, in which the*  
*Pravity of Eutyches and Dioscorus is reproved,*  
*I embrace with all Devotion. I Presume Saint*  
*Gregory believed the Gospels to be infallible in*  
*their Doctrine.*

St. Athenasius (*ad Episc. Afric*) says : *The*  
*Word of God by the Nicean Council does remain*  
*for ever. St. Cyril Alexand. Epist. ad Anast.*  
*Writes thus of the Council of Ephesus : How can*  
*it be doubted but that Christ did preside in*  
*that holy and great Council. St. Leo, whose*  
*Legates presided in the Council of Chalcedon*  
*(Epist. 73. ad Leon. August.) speaketh of the*  
*same Council after this Manner : " Quod O-*  
 " pus Virtutibus vestris, Glorizque conveniens,  
 " celerem & Deo placitum habebit Effectum si  
 " quæ apud Sanctam Chalcedonensem Synodum de  
 " Domini nostri Incarnatione firmata, nulla per-  
 " miseritis Retractione pulsari : Quia in illo  
 " Concilio per Spiritum Sanctum congregato,  
 " tam plenis atque perfectis Definitionibus  
 " cuncta firmata sunt, ut nihil ei Regulæ, quæ ex  
 " divina Inspiratione prolata est, aut addi possit  
 " aut minui." Which Work agreeable to your Vir-  
tue



## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

ture and Glory, will have an Effect speedy and pleasing to God, if you do not suffer the things which were established in the Holy Synod of Chalcedon concerning the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ to be moved by any Rehearing: Because all things were established in that Council, which was assembled by the Holy Ghost, with such full and perfect Definitions, that nothing can be added to, or taken away from that Rule, which was pronounced by divine Inspiration. This certainly is the Language of Men believing the Church to be *Infallible* in the Decisions of her Representatives, the General Councils. Let us now see what the Primitive Fathers have Writ of the Church in general.

St. *Ireneus*, who liv'd in the Age immediately after Christ and his Apostles, has the following Words, *Lib. 3. C. 4.* *Truth is not to be sought from others, which you have easily from the Church; with whom the Apostles have fully deposited all Truth; so that whoever desires it, may have from it the living Waters.*

This cannot be said of a Church, that is capable of leading her Children into Errors. For a Church that can Err, has not all Truth deposited with her.

St. *Cyprian* who lived in the third Century. Writes thus. *Epist. 69. ad Floren. Pupin:* " Et  
" Dominus quoque in Evangelio, cum eum  
" loquentem Discipuli dereliquerunt, Conver-  
" sus ad duodecim dixerit: Numquid & Vos  
" Vultis ire? Respondit ei *Petrus* dicens, Do-  
" mine ad quem ibimus? Verbum Vitæ æternæ  
" habes, & nos credimus & cognovimus, quo-  
" niam tu es Filius Dei vivi. Loquitur illic  
" *Petrus*, super quem edificata fuerat Ecclesia;  
" Ecclesiæ

“ Ecclesiæ Nomine docens, & ostendens, quia  
 “ etsi contumax ac superba obaudire Nolen-  
 “ tium Multitudo discedat, Ecclesia tamen a  
 “ Christo non recedit : Et illi sunt Ecclesia  
 “ Plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo Grex  
 “ adherens.” *Our Lord in the Gospel, when  
 his Disciples went away from him, as he was  
 speaking, turning to the twelve said : What !  
 Will ye also depart ? Peter answer’d him : Lord  
 to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the Words of  
 eternal Life, and we believe and have known  
 that thou art the Son of the Living God. Peter  
 speaks there, upon whom the Church was built,  
 declaring in the Name of the Church, that tho’  
 great Numbers of such stubborn and self-will’d  
 People as will not submit, become Deserters ; yet  
 the Church doth not depart from Christ : Which  
 Church is the People united to the Priest ; and  
 the Flock following their Pastor.*

Again, *Lib. de Unit. Ecclæ* : “ Avelle Ra-  
 “ dium Solis a Corpore, Divisionem Lucis unitas  
 “ non capit : ab Arbore frange Ramum frac-  
 “ tus germinari non poterit : A Fonte præcide  
 “ Rivum, præcisus arefcet. Sic & Ecclesia Do-  
 “ mini Luce persusa per Orbem totum Radios  
 “ suos porrigit, unum tamen Lumen est. Quod  
 “ ubique diffunditur, nec Unitas Corporis  
 “ separatur : Ramos suos in universam Ter-  
 “ ram Copia Ubertatis extendit, profluentes lar-  
 “ gitèr Rivos latius expandit : Unum tamen  
 “ Caput est, & Origo una, & una Mater, Facun-  
 “ ditatis successibus copiosa. Illius Fætu nasci-  
 “ mur, Illius Lacte nutrimur, Spiritu ejus A-  
 “ nimamur. Adulterari non potest Sponsa Christi,  
 “ incorrupta est & pudica : Unam Domum  
 “ novit, unius Cubiculi Sanctitatem casto

“ Pudore Cultodit. Hac nos Deo servat, hæc  
 “ Filios Regno quos generavit assignat.” Take  
 away a Ray from the Body of the Sun, Unity will  
 not bear a Division of the Light : Break a  
 Bough from a Tree, being broken, it cannot  
 Bud : Cut off a Rivulet from the Fountain,  
 being cut off, it dries up : Just so, the Church  
 having received the Light of Christ, spreads it's  
 Rays through the whole *World*. Yet it is one  
 Light, which is thus diffused. Neither is the  
 Unity of the Body divided. By her Fertility,  
 her Branches reach over the Earth, and every  
 Place is water'd by her copious Streams ; yet  
 there is but one Head, and one Fountain, one  
 Mother rich in her numerous Issue. By her  
 Fruitfulness we are Born : we are nourish'd  
 with her Milk, and we are enliven'd by her  
 Spirit. The Spouse of Christ cannot be an  
 Adulteress : She is uncorrupt and Pure, she  
 knows but one House, and with a Chast Mo-  
 desty, preserves the Sanctity of one Chamber ;  
 she it is, that preserves us for God, and assigns  
 a Kingdom to those whom she has begotten.

If St. Cyprian's Testimony be of any weight  
 with your Grace, ( as I presume it is ) he does  
 here, in my humble Opinion, clearly teach the  
 Doctrine of Infallibility. He tells us in the first  
 Passage, that the Church doth not depart from  
 Christ, or is not separated from him. Therefore  
 she will always maintain the Doctrine, which  
 Christ has Taught. And, in the second, that the  
 Spouse of Christ cannot become an Adulteress,  
 but that she is uncorrupt and Pure ; Therefore  
 she cannot be corrupted with false Doctrine ;  
 which is just what we Roman Catholicks now  
 Believe and Teach.

St.



St. Cyril of Alexandria. Dial. de Trin. Lib. 4. writes thus: He gave the Name of the Rock to nothing else, but the unshaken and constant Faith of the Disciple: On which the Church of Christ is so settled and establish'd; as never to fall, but to bear up against the Gates of Hell, and so to remain for ever.

St. Augustin Enar. in Psal. 57. upon these Words: "Alienati sunt Peccatores a Vulva, erraverunt a Ventre, locuti sunt falsa, *speakeeth thus of the Church*: Ideo ergo erraverunt a Ventre, quia locuti sunt falsa? An potius ideo locuti sunt falsa, quia erraverunt a Ventre? In Ventre quippe Ecclesiæ Veritas manet, Quisquis ab hoc Ventre Ecclesiæ separatus fuerit, necesse est ut falsa loquatur. Necesse est, inquam, ut falsa loquatur, Quia aut concipi noluit, aut quem conceptum Mater excussit." Did they therefore go astray from the Womb, because they spoke Lies? Or rather have they not spoken Lies, because they were gone astray from the Womb? For it is in the Womb of the Church that Truth remains. Whosoever is separated from this Womb of the Church, must of necessity speak Lies: I say he must of Necessity speak Lies; For either he wou'd not be conceived, or being conceived, was cast out by the Mother.

Again, Enar. in Psal. 101. upon these Words: *Inconveniundo Populos in unum & Regna, ut serviant Domino.* He hath these Words: "Sed illia Ecclesia quæ fuit omnium Gentium, jam non est, perijt. Hoc dicunt qui in illa non sunt. O impudentem Vocem? Illa non est, quia tu in illa non es? Vide ne tu ideo non sis: Nam illa erit, etsi tu non sis.

“ Hanc Vocem abominabilem & detestabilem,  
 “ Præsumptionis & Falsitatis plænam, nulla Ve-  
 “ ritate suffultam, nulla Sapientia illuminatam,  
 “ nullo Sale conditam Vanam, temerariam, præ-  
 “ cipitem, perniciosam, prævidit Spiritus Dei, &  
 “ tanquam contra illos, cum annuntiaret Unita-  
 “ tem : *In conveniendo Populos in unum &*  
 “ *Rexna ut serviant Domino.* Quoniam qui-  
 “ dam dicturi erant contra : *Fuit et non est,*  
 “ *Exiguitatem,* inquit *Dierum meorum annuncia*  
 “ *mihi.* Quid est quod nescio qui recedentes a  
 “ me murmurant contra me? Quid est quod  
 “ perdit me perisse contendunt? Certè enim  
 “ hoc dicunt, quia fui, & non sum: *Annuncia*  
 “ *mihi Exiguitatem Dierum meorum.* Non a te  
 “ Quæro illos Dies æternos: Illi sine Fine sunt  
 “ ubi ero, non ipsos Quæro: Temporales  
 “ quæro, temporales Dies mihi Annuncia.  
 “ *Exiguitatem Dierum meorum,* non æternita-  
 “ tem *Dierum meorum nuncia mihi.* Quamdiu  
 “ ero in isto Sæculo, annuncia mihi, propter illos  
 “ qui dicunt, *fuit & jam non est:* Propter illos  
 “ qui dicunt, impletæ sunt scripturæ, credide-  
 “ runt omnes Gentes, sed Apostatavit & pe-  
 “ rijt Ecclesia de omnibus Gentibus. Quid est  
 “ hoc *Exiguitatem Dierum meorum annuncia*  
 “ *mihi?* Et annuntiavit, nec vacua fuit Vox  
 “ ista. Quis annuntiavit mihi nisi ipsa Via?  
 “ Quomodo Annuntiavit? *Ecce Ego vobiscum*  
 “ *sum usque ad Consumationem sæculi.*” But  
 that Church, which was spread throughout all  
 Nations, now has no longer a Being. It is quite  
 lost. This is the Cry of those who are not in the  
 Church. Oh, Impudent Clamour! She is not, be-  
 cause you do not belong to her. Beware you  
 have not for that Reason, lost your own Being.  
 For

For she will have a Being, tho' you have none. This abominable and accursed Calumny, full of Presumption and Deceit, void of all Truth, Wisdom and Reason, False, Rash, and Pernicious, the Spirit of God foresaw, when even, as it were, against them he proclaimed her Unity. In assembling the People in one, and Kingdoms to serve our Lord ——— Because there were to arise some that wou'd say against her, 'Tis true, she was, but now she is Perish'd. Shew me, says she, the Fewness of my Days. I do not enquire for my Days in the next World. Those are without End. 'Tis not those Days of Eternity I enquire after. I desire to know my Continuance in this World. These Days I desire you to shew me. And he has shew'd me, neither was the Answer insignificant. And who was it that shewed me? He, that is the very Way: \* And what was the Information he gave me? Behold I am with you to the End of the World.

\* Ego sum  
Via. Veri-  
tas & Vita

And again, " Serm. ad Symb. de Catech.  
" Sequitur post Trinitatis Commendationem,  
" Sanctam Ecclesiam. Demonstratus est Deus  
" & Templum ipsius. Templum enim Dei  
" sanctum est, Ait Apostolus, quod vos estis.  
" Ipsa est Ecclesia Sancta, Ecclesia una, Ec-  
" clesi vera, Ecclesia Catholica, Contra omnes  
" Hereses pugnans: Pugnare potest, expugnari  
" tamen non potest. Hereses omnes de illa  
" exierunt tanquam sarmenta inutilia de Vite  
" præcisa, ipsa autem manet in Radice sua,  
" in Vite sua, in Caritate sua. Porta Inferi  
" non vincent eam."

After a Profession of the Trinity, follows the Holy Church. Here is shewn God and his Temple; For the Temple of God is Holy,



## Of the Infallibility of the Church.

which Temple *saieth the Apostle*, ye are; this is the Holy Church, the one Church, the true Church, the Catholick Church, which fights against all Heresies. Fight she may, but she cannot be Foil'd. All Heresies have gone out from her, like useles Branches lopt off from the Vine, but she remains in her Root, in her Vine, in her Charity. The Gates of Hell shall not overcome her.

I might Instance, my Lord, in many more of the primitive Fathers, both *Greek and Latin*. but I believe these are enough, nay, I fear, I have trespas'd too much upon your Grace's patience. I shall therefore beg leave only to desire your Grace will please to consider, how earnestly these Great Men wrote, and with what Zeal, they stood up against such as said, that the Church did fail, or fall into Error. They maintained, on the Contrary, not only, that she had not fail'd, (nay St. *Augustin* calls it an *impudent Clamour*, an *abominable* and *accursed Calumny* to say she had fail'd) but also that she cannot fail: That it is in the Church's Womb, that Truth remains: That being the Spouse of Christ, she cannot become an Adulteress, but will always be pure and uncorrupt in her Doctrine: That she will always remain in her Root and continue to do so to the End of the World; All which St. *Austin* proves from these two Texts, The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, and, Lo I am with you alway to the End of the World,

The Objections your Grace makes against this Infallibility are couched in the 33d. 34th. and 35th. Paragraphs. They are indeed such

as that I may well say of your Grace, what St. *Augustin* said of St. *Jerom* upon a Debate of another Nature: *Ubi Mulcebar legens, ibi continuo feriebar* However, my Lord, presuming upon your Grace's Goodness, that you will take nothing ill, that is well meant, I shall reduce what I have to offer, in answer to the Objections in the said Paragraphs, to three Heads.

To the *first*, I shall reduce what I have to offer in answer to what your Grace says concerning every Christians being *fallible*.

To the *second*, what I have to offer in answer to what your Grace says concerning the Restraint upon us from reading the Books of *Hereticks*, and the Laity's being prohibited to read the *Scripture*.

To the *third*, what I have to offer in answer to what your Grace says concerning the Seat or Place where the *Infallibility* is to be fixed.

As to the *first*, your Grace says, that, *whatever Imaginations we may have Entertained, touching the Infallibility of our Church, yet it is not so much as pretended that each single Christian is Infallible*.

This is my Lord, very true; for we do not pretend, that any one Man, nor even all Men, consider'd meerly as Men, are *Infallible*, in determining Matters of Faith; but we say, that the Pastors of the Church, that is the *Eclesia Docens*, or it's Representatives in a General Council, legally conven'd, and freely debating, are assisted by the Holy Ghost, and led into all Truth; pursuant to the promises of Christ to that Effect: And this not only the *Clergy* but even the *Laity* of our Communion firmly believe; and therefore, pursuant to the

repeated promises of Jesus Christ to this Purpose, may and ought to rest satisfi'd, that nothing is, or can be propos'd by this Church to the Faithful, concerning Faith or Morals, but what is directed by the Holy Ghost, and consequently no way liable to Error. But this is not the Case with those, who are not of our Communion. We have upon Record, and that uncontestably, the Names of all such as broach'd new Doctrines; as also what Doctrines they broach'd, the Countries they liv'd in, the Year they began; and under what Emperor or King, and in what *Pope's* Reign, and by what Councils they were condemn'd; and this from the Time of the Apostles to this present Day. And I will venture to say, that if so many Minute Circumstances do not Certifie the Truth of a Fact of this Nature, nothing can: Whereas no Man cou'd ever yet, with any Colour of Truth, name the Authors of our pretended Errors, nor fix in what Emperor or Kings Reign, nor the Year or Century, nor finally name any Council or lawful Assembly in which such pretended Error was Condemn'd: A Roman Catholick therefore may assuredly rely upon the Authority of the Church the *Creed* commands him to believe.

Touching the *second*, your Grace is pleased to say, that, *even our learned Men are not allowed, without a particular Licence, to read Heretick Books; nor that we are permitted to read the Holy Scriptures, no not even our own Vulgar Translations of them.*

As to the *first* of these two Points, I answer, that there is a *Pope's Bull*, called *Bulla in Cana Domini*, which forbids, among other things



things, the reading of *Heretick* Books, without special Licence; but this being a Matter of Discipline, does not bind in the Countries where it was not received. But suppose, my Lord; it were absolutely, and every where binding. Is it not good to hinder Men from corrupting their Faith? Doth not *Heresy Creep like a Cancer*? And can there be too much Caution or Care taken to prevent Innocent or Ignorant People from being poison'd by false Doctrine? St. Paul saith; "*Hæreticum Hominem, post unam & secundum Correptionem devita.*" A Man that is an *Heretick* after the first and second Admonition reject. Tit. 3. 10. If then we are, pursuant to the Advice of the Apostle, to reject or shun a Man that is an *Heretick*; why may not we, my Lord, or why ought not we to reject, or shun the Books wherein his *Heresie* is contained?

Touching the *Second*: I believe your Grace forgot to insert the Words (without Leave) because I am persuaded it is not consistent with your Grace's Candour and Sincerity to Impose upon us. For by the *Regula 4<sup>a</sup>. of the Index Lib. Prohib.* No Man is forbidden to read the Vulgar approv'd Translations of the Scripture, provided he has the Leave of the Bishop, which is directed to be granted by the Advice of the Parish-Priest, or Confessor of such Person or Persons. And surely, My Lord, this is no great Restraint; since such Leave is never refused to any pious Catholick, who wou'd for his Edification and Comfort read the divine *Oracles*: But for as much as the *Spider* turns into Poison, and the *Bee* into Honey, what they suck out of the same Flower. It is, in my humble  
Opinion,

### 34 Of the Infallibility of the Church.

Opinion, very advisable there shou'd be some Discernment made, in reading the Scriptures between proud and humble Christians ; which is all that the Council of *Trent* intended by such Prohibition. And indeed, My Lord, I think it were to be wish'd, that such a Restraint had been observed by yourselves : For then we shou'd not see so many *new Sects* spring up constantly, nor have Room to lament the loss of the Souls of so many Thousand Children of *Quakers* and *Anabaptists*, who die without *Baptism*.

As to the *third Head*, your Grace says : " We are not agree'd among ourselves, where to place the *Infallibility* of the Church, whether in the *Pope* singly, or in a *General Council* antecedently to the *Pope's* Confirmation, or only in the *Pope* and *Council* in Conjunction, &c." I answer, My Lord, we are agreed, that the *Infallibility* is placed in the *Pope* and *Council* in Conjunction : Because we believe that all *General Councils*, lawfully call'd, in which the *Pope* presides either in Person or by his Legates, are assisted by the *Holy Ghost* and guided into all Truth. This is the fixt Judgment of all the Catholick Universities in the World, of all *Secular* and *Regular* Schools of Divinity ; and of all the Prelates and Doctors, generally speaking, of all Ages ; who unanimously conspire in the Belief of all *General Councils* in Conjunction with the *Pope*, their having the Assistance of the *Holy Ghost* ; and consequently of being *Infallible* in deciding Matters of Faith and Manners. So that even the little People cannot be long at a Loss to know what Matters of Faith or Manners

*Of the Infallibility of the Church.*

238

Manners have been determin'd or decided in such *Councils*, having their *Pastors* and *Teachers* always ready to Instruct them in the same. *fallible!*

Thus much I presumed, My Lord, to write to your Grace in Justification of my Faith and Religion; and I confide in your Grace's Charity and Goodness, you will not take it ill. Since my only Design is to vindicate my own Religion, being thereunto encouraged by what your Grace recommends unto us, out of *St. Peter: To be always prepared to give Satisfaction to every one, who asketh us a Reason of the Hope that is in us.* Charitable Address Pag. 4. As to what your Grace says of the *Collier's Faith*, and the History of *Peter Barocius*, I will let them stand or fall by their own Weight; and beg leave to assure your Grace, that I am with the most profound Respect.

MY LORD,

Your Grace's most

humble and most

Obedient Servant.

C. NARY.



\*\*\*\*\*

# ERRATA's

**P**Age 14. line 14. for au Read and, Page 23.  
l ult. after Christ himself, add, *and his Saints.*  
p. 158. l. 11. for ot r. of, p. 158. l. 25. for  
famons r. famons, p. 163. l. 5. for duitissimè r.  
diutissimè, p. 211. l. 9. for his r. this.

21 JA 50

\*\*\*\*\*

